The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1919 No. 2812

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 819

EDITORIALS:
The Golden Eggs 822
The Shipping Dilemma 823
Americanization 823
The Instinct for Style 824
The Oversea Flights 825

THE PEACE TREATY:
I. Liberalism and the Treaty. By H. W. Massingham 826
II. The Treaty's Moral Failure. By Felix Adler 827

CHINA AND JAPAN:
I. A Chinese View. A Cabled Interview with Wellington Koo 828
II. A Japanese View. By Baron Goto 828
III. An American View. By William Elliot Griffis 830

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:
Four Capitals. By H. G. Alsberg 831

RECENT IRISH POETRY. By Padraic Colum 832

CRAWFORD HOWELL TOY. By Samuel McCord Crothers 834

SHANTUNG. By Witter Bynner 835

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 835

CORRESPONDENCE 836

LITERATURE:
"Lion's" Letters 837
American Types 838
The Way Out 839
Tales Well Made 840

BOOKS IN BRIEF 841

DRAMA: "John Ferguson." By T. H. 842

FINANCE: Financing Other Nations. By William Justus Boies 843

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 844

SUPPLEMENT:
Out of his Own Mouth 846
Liberal Criticism 851

WORDS, words, and more words—this sums up President Wilson's message to Congress. Like his last address to Congress, it again reveals a total bankruptcy of ideas as to reconstruction. True, the politician asserts himself in the appeal to Congress and the country and the State Legislatures to find a way to a new relationship between capital and labor, thus confirming the report which has been current that he would seek to put himself at the head of the liberal movement in this country now that he is returning bankrupt from Paris. But for any practical suggestion as to how the actual working partnership between capital and labor is to be recognized Mr. Wilson has nothing to bring out beyond glittering generalities. Despite the fact that the Constitutional Amendment is to go into effect so soon, he asks for the repeal of the war-time prohibition law. The representative of a party which has prided itself upon its doctrine of a tariff for revenue only, he now throws over this doctrine in favor of a protective tariff on dye stuffs and chemicals: and fresh from assuring us that the world is now made over for peace, he hints darkly that we may have to encounter hostile tariff legislation abroad shortly. From whose side? That of our Allies? The enemy is so hobbled that he cannot think of any such legislation. Railways and telephones and telegraphs are to go back to private ownership very shortly; though in December last he was unable to decide whether or not to take the railways, and so left the matter to Congress. Only on woman's suffrage does he sound a clear note. For the rest, this cabled message is the very weakest among the President's state documents.

THE International Congress of Women, now in session at Zurich, under the presidency of Miss Jane Addams, has addressed a memorial to the Peace Conference, condemning the proposed peace terms as violative of the principles upon which alone a just peace is possible, and of the expectations of democrats the world over. The memorial does particularly well to insist strongly upon the fact which the conferees so dearly wish might be forgotten, that the peace terms "guarantee the fruits of secret treaties to the conquerors." It is greatly to the credit of these women's perspicacity that they discern so clearly and state so accurately the true position of the secret treaties in the international settlement; and we hope they will continue in and out of season to be outspoken about it hereafter. Surely it is a monstrous thing that when Mr. Lloyd George and M. Pichon spoke all their fair words disclaiming any intention against the future of Germany, when they turned themselves into a feeble echo of Mr. Wilson's exalted sentiments about the kind of peace that ought to come and must come —it is a most monstrous thing that when they did this they had the secret treaties in their pockets. Again, at the time when Mr. Balfour and M. Viviani came here on their mission, President Wilson either knew of the secret treaties or he did not. If he did not, the fact carries extremely unfortunate implications against his intelligence; if he did, it carries far more unfortunate implications against his integrity. We hope the International Conference will continue to keep these disagreeable but salutary truths steadily before the attention of the American people and of the world. The women's memorial to the Peace Conference is honest and straightforward, and Mr. Wilson has returned this characteristic reply: "Your message appeals both to my intellect and heart, and I sincerely desire that means may be found to comply with it, although the prospects are far from reassuring because of the immense practical difficulties." If Mr. Wilson will cease from contemplation of the "immense practical difficulties" that confront him as he pursues his course in sublime righteousness, and will turn his eyes aside long enough to observe the conduct of the nine American experts who have done themselves and their country credit by courageously resigning from his Peace Commission rather than to be parties to the peace that Mr. Wilson and his two associates have planned to foist on the world, he will discover at least one line of action that a man can pursue in circumstances such as those which now confront him.

IN 1912, when the Italians occupied the Dodecanesus Islands during the war with Turkey, they were welcomed as friends and liberators. General Ameglio, the commander-in-chief of the Italian army of occupation, declared to the Dodecanesians, "I assure you, in the most categorical manner, that after the termination of the Italo-Turkish war, the islands which are under the temporary occupation of Italy will receive an autonomous system of government and that the Turks will never return. I tell you this both as a general and as a Christian, and you may consider my words as gospel truth." The Dodecanesians responded with certain resolutions, adopted at a secret con-

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vention on the island of Patmos which expressed to their "sister nation Italy" gratification at having been released from the unbearable Turkish yoke, but at the same time proclaimed "the age-long national wish of the islanders for union with their motherland, Greece." These sentiments apparently aroused the indignation rather than the sympathy of Italy. From that time on, every expression of national sentiment has been suppressed by the Italian authorities, and the final possession of the islands was assured to Italy by the terms of the Treaty of London in 1915. Their recent assignment to Greece must be generally approved, particularly since the best available figures show that the Greek population of the islands is approximately 143,000, while the small remainder consists of 4,500 Turks and 2,500 Jews—with Italians conspicuously and completely missing. Even a small concession to honest national feeling is a welcome variation from the dull routine of international barter and theft.

LESS enthusiasm will probably be exhibited for the Greek mandate in Smyrna. Although the population is rather more than half Greek, with a large admixture of Jews and Mohammedans, the method of establishing Greek control suggests little appeal to the principle of self-determination. The British and French sent fleets with landing parties to the port; the Greeks dispatched a battleship and five gunboats, and the Italians were represented by five large warships. Even the United States lent its authority to the establishment of the mandate through the presence of the battleship "Arizona" and four destroyers. In addition, "it is understood that British and French forces are coöperating in the Greek administrative mandate," while Italian troops have landed at Adalia on the southern coast of Asia Minor, and Greek troops have already been reported in bloody combat with the Turks in the streets of Smyrna. This minor engagement is instructive as to the hope that lies in the mandatory system, that creature of dreary compromise. If the armies and navies of all the principal Allied Governments are required to establish a mandate over a town of 350,000 people, more than half of whom are of the nationality of the mandatory Power, what may we expect in the imposition of this system on the world?

QUITE the most significant item in the week's news is the dispatch from Paris stating that a loan of $100,000,000 will be made to the Chinese Government by a consortium of American, British, French, and Japanese bankers. The negotiations have been carried on in connection with the Peace Conference, the central figure, so far as American interests are concerned, being Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Co. Four advances of $25,000,000 each are planned, and the terms, including the maturities and the rate of interest, will be determined at Allied banking conferences after the peace treaties have been signed. It is expected that the bulk of the money loaned will be obtained in the United States, and it is stated that, for the present, at least, the French share of the loan will be taken by the American group, which includes more than thirty banks in all parts of the country, and represents our most powerful financial interests. The State Department guarantees support to the project under conditions laid down last summer, squarely reversing the policy that led to the withdrawal of American bankers from the Six-Power loan group in 1913.

WE are little given to discovering conspiracies, and we do not suspect honest bankers and State Department officials of a deep-laid plot to make American soldiers guarantee the profits of American investors in China. Nor do we desire to call attention, in the way of captious criticism, to the inconsistencies of our Government. In 1913 it withdrew its support from the projected Chinese loan group because, in the President's own words, the loan provisions "touch very nearly the administrative independence of China." The loan is apparently now being used to secure unwilling Chinese signatures to a peace treaty embodying the iniquitous Shantung provisions, as well as the League of Nations, whose combined military force can be placed behind all the arrangements of Inter-Allied finance in China and everywhere else. "The administrative independence of China" under such arrangements is likely to be something less than a shadow.

THE particular acts of this or that Government, however, are unimportant by comparison with the normal development of the financial system which is the ruling power in world affairs today. Months ago we called the attention of our readers to the possibility of an Anglo-American imperialism that would dominate the world. The Chinese consortium is one of its first fruits. Witness the following frank dispatch of Frederick Moore, which appeared in the *New York Tribune* of Saturday last:

> While constructing the treaty which crippled Germany's commercial growth, the Anglo-American peacemakers have developed an alliance for the development of the world's markets. This stupendous undertaking will have ramifications into all parts of the world. Foremost in the movement will be American business men.
>
> The Chinese consortium is only a single feature of the combination, which is being formed for both political and commercial reasons.
>
> American capital and American engineers undoubtedly will develop the Saar coal mines, and American money and railway men will turn their attention to Asia Minor, Syria, Turkey and Palestine will have new interests for Americans.
>
> But by far the greatest adventure will be that in China where four, possibly five countries, will attempt to coöperate in the development of this land of four hundred millions of people.

"Constructing the treaty which crippled Germany's commercial growth"; "foremost will be American business men"; "formed for both political and commercial reasons"—no reader of modern history can miss the significance of these phrases, and every thoughtful person may well reexamine the peace treaty and the League of Nations project in their light.

"I AM now fully persuaded," wrote John Brown, shortly before his conviction, "that I am worth inconceivably more to hang than for any other purpose." If the spirit of Edith Cavell looked down last week upon the simple services in Westminster Abbey which commemorated the removal of her remains to her native country, something of the same thought must have come to her. It was characteristic of both the stupidity and the snobbishness of the German military rulers that when they had caught eight persons in the conspiracy to which Edith Cavell gladly lent herself they executed two who seemed the least well-connected and important of the group. An insignificant English nurse? Who would care if she were shot? It speedily appeared that the meddlesome American diplomats did care, and then, when

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the deed was done, it turned out that the whole non-German world cared, that the executioners had blindly conferred immortality upon her whose mortal life they had ended, that the insignificant middle-class English nurse had become one of the saints and martyrs of the war. History will weave poetic myths about her from now on; her soul, too, will go marching on, and her story will by itself shed more light upon the stupidity of the German militarists and their inability to appreciate the psychology of other nations than will any other single episode of their reign of terror in Belgium. It was a fine thing to take her body back to England; it was even finer that the escort through London was merely one company of troops instead of a great display of soldiery, but best of all was that simple service in the greatest of memorial edifices in the world. If its significance did not strike home in Berlin, then there must still be much to learn on Unter den Linden.

WITH the return of post-bellum sanity, our ante-bellum war myths, which served to inflame public opinion, are being exploded one by one. Gratifyingly enough, correction is being made by some of the officials who were responsible for the misinformation. Thus General March, our Chief of Staff, announces that those alarming figures given out before the war concerning the number of troops that England or France or Germany could land in America, in the event of their defeating our fleet and conquering our coast defenses, were quite misleading, and that the actual possibilities would be far less than the official figures with which the National Security League made so great a play. The error, General March points out, was due to the fact that it was supposed that transports could make the round trip to America and back in thirty days (from both England and the more distant Germany!) and now it appears that the best that can be done by our vessels on their trips to France is thirty-five days. Then there was the German navy. What a growing menace that was to our shores we all remember. It was constantly crowding us down to third place in the world's navies, and was plainly being built as an offensive and not as a defensive fleet. Yet on Saturday last the statement was officially made, upon Mr. Daniels's arrival in this country, that he had examined the surrendered German ships in England, and that the American navy wanted none of them, as their bunker capacity turned out to be so limited as to prove that they were built for fighting in European waters only and that they were therefore of no avail to the American navy. But these same ships were supposed to be proof in 1916 that Germany had long planned a raid upon our shores.

A GENERAL strike is in progress in the city of Winnipeg, involving over sixty labor unions. It was called on May 15, in aid of the metal workers' and building trades' unions. The issue is that of the right of collective bargaining. Some of the unusual features of the strike are the suppression of newspapers, the participation of postal employees, and the fact that the police appear to be exempt only on sufferance of the strike committee; since a note in the *Manitoba Free Press* of May 15 announces that "the strike committee has decided not to call out the policemen." The newspapers (except the *Western Labor Union*) were suppressed deliberately, because, the union leaders declare, they are powerful in moulding public opinion, and in the past opinion had been "moulded against our class." The city is without postal service, telephone, telegraph, express, and street-railway service. The railway service is badly crippled by the participation of local employees, Winnipeg being the gateway to the West for both the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk transcontinental systems. One report states that the city is under rule of a Soviet and that several neighboring cities are contemplating measures to establish Soviet rule by means of the general strike; but this seems far-fetched and improbable, and is likely to reflect no matter of fact beyond the economic power wielded by the strike committee. If the committee had taken over any of the functions of municipal government, it would seem that the report could not but be more specific about the change.

WERE our metropolitan dailies really bent upon recording significant facts in the labor movement, they would have given columns last week to the meeting of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor in Harrisburg. That body unanimously reëlected as its president James H. Maurer, who is already serving his seventh term as head of the organization. During his incumbency, he has opposed preparedness and our entrance into the war, and he figured on the ridiculous Stevenson suspect list. Next, the convention voted "amid tremendous cheering" that organized labor, having no longer anything to hope for from the Republican and Democratic parties, must turn to independent political action. The Federation's executive committee is therefore to report principles and a line of action to a special convention. Even more striking was the passage of a resolution denouncing the Allied and American policy in Russia and demanding the withdrawal of American troops and the immediate lifting of the blockade. This was coupled with a demand for the release of all political and war-time prisoners and the recognition of the Irish Republic. Finally, there was a vigorous attack upon the Civic Federation, which was charged with seeking "to administer chloroform to the trade-union movement." No wonder it is reported that the old-line leaders of the American Federation of Labor are becoming nervous as to what may happen at the Atlantic City convention next month.

THE death of Bishop Greer removes not only the foremost Episcopalian cleric but a man of widest and truest sympathies. Profoundly conscious that the present conditions in the world are directly antagonistic to the preservation of the church as it has been, he looked ahead to see how it could be brought back to the teachings of Jesus. A thorough pacifist at heart, for the war he had no enthusiasm whatever. He knew that great armaments are anti-Christian and lead to bloodshed, and from the beginning to the end of the struggle he preached neither hate nor bitterness, leaving unworthy acts of this kind to clergymen of the type of William T. Manning. No better example could have been set by Bishop Greer short of his coming out openly against the whole monstrous teaching that the world can be advanced by deliberate, wholesale flouting of the Commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." Bishop Greer's was a modest, unassuming, sweet-spirited personality. It will not be easy to find a worthy successor who will look to the future with a clear realization of the resentment with which the church is regarded by millions for its complete moral failure since 1914, and will help to guide it towards its regeneration.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Golden Eggs

THE economic conditions of the peace treaty, as outlined in the cabled summary, call for serious reflection on the part of thoughtful people everywhere. Germany is an industrial state, despite forty years of agricultural protection. She has lived by her coal and iron, her textile, chemical, electrical, and other manufactures, and latterly by her rapidly growing world trade. Rob her of her coal and iron, take away her applied science, strangle her trade, and not only can she pay no indemnities, she can scarcely support two-thirds of her present population. How has the Paris Conference met these inexorable economic conditions?

Germany is to lose Alsace-Lorraine, the Saar valley, and Upper Silesia, which among them yield about one-third of the coal and more than one-half of the iron ore of Germany —the foundation on which her industry and trade are built and by the taxation of which indemnities might conceivably be paid. These districts contain proved coal reserves of 24,000,000,000 tons—a third of Germany's total supply, while of her indicated reserves they hold no less than two-thirds. The two and a half billion tons of iron ore in Lorraine again make up two-thirds of the entire German reserve. We say nothing of Silesian zinc and other metals. All this natural wealth passes at a blow to Germany's conquerors, and with it nearly a fourth of her textile industry. Danzig, ninth among German ports, is "internationalized."

The Germans relinquish the right to draw any revenue from the Kiel Canal, and agree to construct a Rhine-Meuse Canal if Belgium so requires. They consent to the putting of the Rhine and the Elbe under international commissions controlled by the Allies. They assure freedom of transit through German territories by rail or water to "persons, goods, ships, carriages, and mails from or to any of the Allied or associated Powers, without customs or transit duties, undue delays, restrictions, or discriminations." They agree to insure communication between the Allies on German railways, to allow within twenty-five years the construction of such lines as are necessary, and to conform German rolling stock so as to enable its incorporation in Allied trains. They further guarantee Allied ships the same rights as German vessels in German ports.

Under the armistice terms, it will be recalled, Germany was required to surrender to the Allies 5,000 locomotives, 150,000 cars, and 5,000 motor trucks. She now undertakes the physical restoration of the devastated areas, pledging thereto the delivery of animals and machinery now in Germany, and promising to manufacture materials for reconstruction purposes. She agrees to make good to France for ten years any deficiency in the output of the Nord and Pas de Calais districts—which produce two-thirds of France's coal—below the pre-war product, and in addition gives to France, Belgium, and Italy options at prices to be fixed in the treaty on 21,500,000 tons of coal annually—one-seventh of Germany's pre-war production. Further, she must for three years deliver benzol, coal tar, and ammonia to France.

She is stripped of her ships. Under plea of replacing shipping lost, the victorious Powers take all German vessels of 1,600 gross tons and upward, one-half of those between 1,600 and 1,000 tons, and one-quarter of the steam trawlers and the other fishing fleet. When the war began, Germany had a merchant fleet of magnificent vessels totaling 5,300,000 tons; when it ends, she will have none worth mentioning. In addition, she is bound to build a million tons of ships for the Allies within five years.

Abroad, she loses literally everything. All her cables are appropriated. Her African colonies are stripped from her, along with the possibility of exploiting their resources. In Shantung, she gives up the mines, railways, and cables, with the splendid works that she has erected in Kiaochow, and all her rights, privileges, and concessions. The same is true of Tientsin and Hankow. German interests are completely cleaned out of China, and the same thing will doubtless occur in Turkey and Bulgaria. Germany agrees to expropriate and transfer to the Reparations Commission all the rights and interests of her nationals in the public utilities of ceded territories, mandatory territories, China, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey. China is released from the Boxer indemnity. All private enemy property seized or damaged by Germany is to be restored or paid for, while the nationals of Allied states are freed of debts owing to Germans, who are to be compensated by the German Government. Thus are Germany and the Germans stripped of all opportunity in industry and trade abroad, so far as the conquerors can dictate.

Left thus to labor with their bare hands in the despoiled homeland, the German people accept the responsibility of themselves and their allies for all the damage caused by the war to the Allied Governments and peoples. The total of indemnities (called compensation) is to be fixed by an Inter-Allied Commission not later than May 1, 1921, and is to be discharged within thirty years. Germany is to repay with five per cent. gold bonds due in 1926 all sums borrowed by Belgium from her Allies (some $430,000,000 from Great Britain alone). In general, Germany pledges an initial indemnity payment of 20,000,000,000 marks within two years "in either gold, goods, ships, or other specific forms of payment." In addition, she is to issue bonds for 40,000,000,000 marks gold, bearing two and one-half per cent. interest from 1921 to 1926, and five per cent. thereafter, and 40,000,000,000 marks in five per cent. gold bonds under terms to be fixed by the Reparations Commission. Even assuming the discharge of these bonds within thirty years, interest would add another 60,000,000,000 marks, making the total specifically required at least 160,000,000,000 marks. Driven off the seas and out of the world's markets, stripped of all their oversea property, rights, and privileges, of their ships, cables, colonies, and trade connections, the Germans are economically imprisoned within their own borders. Staggering under a public debt that will call for an annual interest contribution of almost $40 per capita in addition to current Government expenses, with their richest provinces torn away, and with their economic equipment exhausted by war, every German family must yearly for the next thirty years pay out of its scanty earnings to the Allied Governments the sum of $100. Whether Germany signs or does not sign the treaty, these provisions will not be carried out, because they cannot be.

We pass no moral judgment on this impossible document or the men who framed it. When hatred, murder, and all the baser passions have for five years been sanctified under the name of patriotism, it is not strange if cupidity and fear have their day at the settlement. But for Woodrow Wilson to negotiate such a peace is to betray all the principles to which he has pledged us; for the American people to assent to the peace that he has negotiated would be to disclose a blindness and moral callousness beyond belief.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Shipping Dilemma

"THE American Flag must float in every port in the world"; "Give us the money and we'll give you the ships"; "America never started a job she did not finish"—these were some of the banners carried in the extraordinary parade of 82,000 shipyard workers in Philadelphia last Saturday. Representing ten yards in the vicinity of that city, these powerful factors in the shipbuilding situation at least know what they want—the appropriation of six hundred million more dollars to finish the existing ship programme. They are equally emphatic, too, in stating that it is not necessary to give American contracts to Chinese and Japanese yards, as has recently been done; Americans are ready to build the ships, and the industry is a-tremble as to its future. But if the workers know their minds no one else in the shipbuilding industry seems to. The Republicans, it is announced, intend to take some kind of stand in the new Congress, but what it is going to be no one has the remotest suspicion. Mr. Hurley's plan seems to have pleased very few, and so everything is in flux. On top of it all comes the news that, at the risk of offending the Ally with whom beyond all others we ought to live on the friendliest terms, we are going to keep the enemy ships that fell into our hands when we began to war upon Germany. If the railroad situation is in chaos, the shipping situation is equally so.

Only one thing stands out clearly: there is nowhere any real demand for permanent Government ownership and operation—a grateful thing, since if there is one policy that ought to be excluded from the discussion it is that. Among all the banners in the Philadelphia parade there does not seem to have been one that even suggested such action, and it is well known that leaders of the seamen's unions like Andrew Furuseth are absolutely opposed to a policy of this kind. Government supervision they desire, and restriction upon unlimited competition, chiefly through international agreements as to wages and conditions of employment, but they have seen a good deal of the workings of Government at close range before and during the war and complete Government ownership and operation appeal to them not at all.

But what then? In a single week we have announcements that we are calmly to appropriate the German ships that fell into our hands, that the whole of our badly built and practically useless wooden ships are offered for sale, and that there is now a surplus of cargo ships which is growing so rapidly that the Government would be ready to sell the best of them at once if only it could work out a permanent policy and then decide the question of sale in accordance with it. The less valuable ships it is beginning to dispose of now. But how can the Shipping Board oblige the shipyard workers and appeal to Congress for the six hundred extra millions when it has more ships than it now needs? To finish up the programme in the hope that some foreigners will be tempted to buy these ships at their war-time costs is obviously a speculation that no Government body would venture to indulge in, particularly as the past week has seen the throwing open of our shipyards to orders from foreign countries. This may help to keep some of our yards busy. But foreign shipyards also are not idle. In the United Kingdom they are turning out at this moment some 2,254,845 tons, in Japan 254,835, in Canada 303,088, and in Holland 182,308. More than that, England and France, as well as the United States, are to profit by the appropriation of the German merchant marine—and Germany is bound by the peace treaty to build 200,000 tons of shipping for the Allies during each of the next five years.

Now, as there were some 15,067,861 tons of shipping destroyed during the war, and as there are no less than 7,796,266 tons of shipping on the stocks at this moment in the United States and abroad, it is obvious that with the million tons the Germans must supply we shall have made good a large share of the total loss without counting in the new ship construction during the war. Plainly if we in the United States are going to continue to build ships at the present furious rate the world will soon have much more tonnage than at the outbreak of hostilities. But can it use more? Germany is wrecked and is prohibited by the peace treaty from reviving industrially and economically. All the rest of Europe trembles on the brink of financial ruin, famine, and revolution, and no one can foretell what will be the situation a year or two years hence. It is all very well to talk of our going after the world's trade in order to wrest the supremacy of the seas from England, but where and what is that trade to be? Plainly Mr. Hurley is wise in calling a three-day conference of the representatives of some fifty important national organizations to meet in Washington this week to discuss his proposals. It is a problem so difficult that the wisdom of numbers is needed.

Americanization

THE various plans for Americanization that have come before us seem to fall into three categories. Some of them are obvious devices to influence the foreign vote toward one or another political organization. Others are devices, equally obvious, to facilitate the exploitation of foreign labor. Others, again, which it is a pleasure to believe are wholly disinterested, serious, and well-intended, seem to be devices for indoctrinating the foreigner with the superiority of our language, habits, cultural institutions, and practices over his own; devices, in short, for making him, whether for better or worse, as much as possible like ourselves. With the first two classes we shall not now concern ourselves beyond remarking their essential dishonesty; but we may perhaps profitably discuss the nationalistic philosophy upon which the third class is based.

That it is the bounden duty of the foreigner to forget his own ways as speedily as possible and to learn ours, to forego his own language and cultural specialties and make the best fist he can at ours, is a pleasing assumption on our part, and in some respects justified; for like every civilization on earth, ours has some points of notable superiority over others. Still, most of these the foreigner knows of before he arrives; they are what attracts him here. As to the rest, and as to the notion that he should generally conform to our habits and ways merely because they are ours and to the complete discouragement or exclusion of his own, the situation should be looked at somewhat more from the standpoint of the foreigner than most of the Americanization plans that we have examined appear to do. After all, if the superiority of our civilization is at all points such as we assume, would not the foreigner be apt, in time, to discover it for himself; and is the process of assimilation really expedited by our inflexible attitude toward him? The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very small amount of imagination necessary to put oneself in his place will answer these questions at once; and then one is on the way toward a sound policy of Americanization.

The American people can *do* nothing, we are convinced, to Americanize foreigners. There is no machinery that is competent; perhaps our sublime faith in the omnipotence of machinery, especially the machinery of organization, is one of the very points at which the foreigner shies off from our attempts. It is not a case for machinery, not a case for *doing*, but a case for *being*. We can *be* something that will Americanize immigrants and assimilate them rapidly and naturally, of their own motion; and that something is very different from the figure we have hitherto appeared before them. It would seem that the remarkable fact of the present exodus of foreigners would cause our people to look twice at the ground of their assumptions about their own civilization. These foreigners have had the benefit of enormously high wages. They have saved their money; and now that the war is over, they are going back to Europe in shoals, and, according to their statement, going to stay. Now, if our civilization possessed intrinsic powers of attraction commensurate with the opportunity it offered these people to get work and lay up money, it is unlikely that so many would be leaving it. For the present generation of us, perhaps, it does possess those powers; our demands upon it are few; what it has is largely the work of our own hands or our fathers', and we are laudably proud and contented. But looking at the situation from the standpoint of the foreigner, we find that for him it possesses hardly any power of attraction at all.

We may then stand our ground stolidly and say, so much the worse for the foreigner. Resentment is natural; but if translated into action, it does the America of the next generation a great disservice. That America will be a better place than this, its life will be larger; we want to have it so, our children will make it so. Then let us not deny them the powerful help of the foreigner, though we ourselves have been too preoccupied or too unintelligent to recognize its value and accept it for use in fashioning the America that now is. Let our children weigh the criticism of the foreigner without prejudice, realizing that it is apt to be more objective than our own or even than theirs, and then turn upon him and demand his cultural contribution toward remedying the defects he alleges. The foreigner says that our civilization does nothing for the claims of the intellect, of beauty, of the poetry of life, of the social instinct. When we complain of his ingratitude toward our efforts to make him like ourselves, he quotes Burke to the effect that "there should be in every country a standard of manners that a well-formed mind would be disposed to relish. For us to love our country, our country ought to be lovely"—and tells us quite plainly that our country, despite its many points of superiority, is not lovely; that our civilization, with all its power and wealth, is not *interesting*, that it lacks amenity, is not amiable. Our children, then, as the iron force of prejudice inevitably loosens, will say, Very well, help us make it so. Give us your contribution toward a larger life in exchange for what you have got from us in the things wherein we excel. This is Americanization, practicable and salutary; but it will not be done by committees or programmes, but by the grace of a new spirit.

Then the new generation will look back at us who prided ourselves on being good business men, and marvel how we could be so unbusinesslike as to have these rich potential resources of civilization under our hand and never tap them. Is it conceivable, they will say, that New York could have harbored more Italians than Rome and yet they were encouraged to leave no more of a characteristic mark on the general culture of the city? How is it possible that great settlements of Slavs and Celts, quick-witted, sentimental people, naturally well-mannered, lived so long in our Middle States without being laid mercilessly under contribution against the dismal and illiberal ideals of social life prevailing there? Then they will read, perhaps, of our inept proposals to Americanize these people by machinery—proposals as of those who would do all the teaching and none of the learning, all the giving and none of the taking, all the preaching and none of the practicing—and be thankful for the knowledge that Americanization is possible only according to the manner of spirit that Americans themselves are of.

The Instinct for Style

A PROFESSOR of Romance literature in one of the huge mid-Western universities remarked to us the other day that no one of his acquaintance, whether within the university or without, seemed ever to read for pleasure. He meant by this that no one seemed ever to read for the sake of the delight, closely akin to the delight one experiences from music, that a certain order of literary style abundantly furnishes. This criticism appears sound. Most of us read for information, or for what may be called in a general way trade purposes, or else for the sake of helping ourselves through the passage of otherwise idle time. Reading to keep alive and strengthen the disinterested instinct for style, reading for the exhilaration that the exercise of this instinct brings with it—this, perhaps, is not, the country over, much in our way.

Let us be quite sure about the identification of this instinct. George Borrow says that in a report of a criminal trial at Newgate he found a sentence which he always afterward treasured as a model of English narrative prose-style. It was this:

> Then I went with them to a music-booth, where they made me almost drunk with gin, and began to talk their flash language, which I did not understand.

The instinct that could unerringly seize upon the literary quality of this sentence, lift it at once above its squalid associations, appropriate it with delight and keep again and again recurring to it out of sheer pleasure in the perfection of workmanship—this is the instinct we mean. Indeed, there is no surer evidence of the healthy working of this instinct than the possession in memory of great numbers of short detached examples of first-class literary art. The mind automatically stores itself with them, as the mind of the musician stores itself with certain standard and definitive melodies upon which there is no possible improvement. Their subject may be noble and elevated, it may be indifferent, or it may be low and mean; if the instinct for style is at work, it will in each case react with pleasurable emotion. *But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up*—here the subject is noble and elevated; and the instinct which thrills one with intense feeling for the style of this great sentence is the one we speak of. It is the instinct which keeps one reading

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and re-reading, say, the first dozen chapters of Tolstoy's "What Is to be Done?" as one would over and over again listen to a suite of Bach; the instinct that liberates towards, say, certain scenes in Turgenev's "Phantoms" the same order of emotion that would be stirred by a sight of Giotto's circle. In these examples, again, the subject is elevated, and more or less sustains the writer. The subject of Borrow's sentence, on the other hand, is low and mean, and gives the writer no support. For a further example in the same order, here is a sentence that we ourselves saw quoted the other day in a newspaper:

> His nose was as large as two noses; it was covered with warts; on top of each wart was a pimple, and out of each pimple grew a hair. He was a beaut.

Here the subject may not be called low and mean; it is revolting, no one could think of it without disgust. But what a sentence! What force, directness, simplicity, rapidity, sketching this picture in thirty-three words, and twenty-nine of them monosyllables! The effect produced by this, the reaction of the instinct for style, is akin to that produced by reading Homer; the difference being that the effect of Homer is sustained throughout book after book, while the effect produced by other writers is more or less occasional. But the instinct which instantly fastens on writing of this order, wherever found and whatever its subject, and delights itself in it, is the instinct that we wish to identify.

Unless one takes outright ground with Mr. Gradgrind, one would probably admit that pleasure is an aid to education, that this instinct is a good thing, and that if it could be gotten in better working order and more generally distributed, we should have, on the whole, a more interesting life; a life too, possibly of more solidity and depth. Here, we have always felt, is the real reason for studying Greek and Latin literature; because they do more for this instinct than any other, they are more enjoyable than any other. But we are quite aware of the impracticability of seriously proposing the enjoyment of an alien literature to a people that has not discerned any moving reason why it should enjoy its own. Perhaps the army tests may have put us in sight of such a reason. It is well enough to insist on reading, reading with some sort of a vocational purpose to guide it; but above all it should be made clear that reading can be enjoyed, and that until it is practiced with a pretty definite view towards enjoyment, its formative value will be slight, and its practice neglected as far as vocational interests permit. Matthew Arnold said with but slight exaggeration, that if he lived to be eighty he would probably be the only person in England who read anything but newspapers and scientific publications. The United States is able to do, and should do, much better. Its educational apparatus is so large, so flexible, and so easily accessible, that it could do better without trouble or sacrifice.

And in time, of course, it will. We wish merely to suggest that the process can be accelerated by keeping pleasure in view as a definite and worthy end. Too much, however, may not be expected from the colleges and universities in establishing the instinct for style. They can encourage this instinct but cannot implant it; this is work for earlier cultural influences. The secondary schools have their part, but by far the largest part lies behind even them. The enjoyment of literature is largely set by the contagion of custom and example; and those who are exposed to it continuously through early childhood are seldom wholly perverted afterwards.

The Oversea Flights

WHERE is the American whose heart has not thrilled to the flight of the American aviators to the Azores and to the apparently tragic bravery of Hawker and Grieve in their effort to fly across to Ireland? Peace treaty, affairs in Germany and Russia, even the opening of Congress, have faded from the first pages before the bulletins about the men who have cheerfully faced death to set a new record in human achievement. One must go back to the first reports of the discovery of the North Pole to find a parallel to the public excitement. After the long years of war, the world responds gladly to a new sensation not affiliated with bloodshed. To the sporting spirit, too, the appeal is great; for these men have played with death in their effort to out-fly the elements. Yet it is not just a rash defiance of wind and fog and sea that we have been witnessing, not a mere "stunt," but the pioneer flights which must be undertaken if flying is to be developed beyond its present limitations.

That the Americans have all arrived safely at their first destination is cause for great rejoicing. Yet it was not unexpected. Americans have come to have so high an admiration for the efficiency of their navy as to take it for granted that whatever it does will be well done, and the record of the flight shows how admirably the men lived up to the navy's best traditions. That gives the best ground for hoping that the rest of the flight will be as fortunate, that at least one of the remaining hydroplanes will reach England. Luck will, of course, count, but Secretary Daniels properly points out that a success like this is not merely the result of a haphazard flying off, but is due in largest part to rigid training, careful scientific study, and the gaining of long experience in flying. The art of flying was not encompassed when the first modern airplane winged its way, nor has all the experience of the best military fliers upon our battlefields afforded all the light and knowledge desired. Wonderful as has been its development, flying has far to go to prove that there are great commercial possibilities ahead of it.

True, Postmaster General Burleson's just published report of the first year of the aerial post shows an alleged profit of $19,000, and reports the loss of only one life and one aeroplane. If the cost of that aeroplane alone were to be charged against this service the profit would be small. Yet we would not belittle the fact that the service has been maintained in every kind of weather, under conditions often extremely trying, and that much business has been found for it. Doubtless the pony post across the plains did not pay for itself in cash; yet it was a necessary pioneering part of the development of the West, and if there is to be complete conquest of the air the question of profit or loss is of small moment in these years of development. But the inventors have much to do in developing the aircraft before it can be certain that commercial success awaits the companies formed here and in England with a view to regular service for passengers. The atmospheric conditions, the danger from fogs, the comparatively short period during which a flier can act as aerial chauffeur, and the great cost of the airships are all serious difficulties. But it is just such ventures as those that have given the world its thrill during the past week which will gradually throw light upon the subject and bring about greater and greater improvements in the craft that take the air.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Peace Treaty

I. Liberalism and the Treaty

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have been asked to contribute to the debate on the peace treaty, which you have opened with so much decision. But what am I to say? I am indeed a liberal, and in the last number of the *Dial* Professor Veblen claims the treaty as a new descent on earth of the "spirit of mid-Victorian liberalism." Well, mid-Victorian liberalism has an ancestry and a history. Which shall I invoke? Shall Charles James Fox answer for the doctrine of Paris? Or shall Gladstone's name sell a nation into slavery, and Cobden's and Bright's propose it as tributary to a League of Armed Nations?

Failing these witnesses, what has a British liberal to do with the treaty of Paris? It came from no liberal Government, and no liberal opinion was invoked in its behalf. Neither is it a British or an American conception. All that the liberals in Britain or America can possibly want from the war is to see civilization at work again on terms which dispose equally of Germany's claim to dominance and France's claim to wipe Germany off the map. Something more may be conceded to the spirit of war and to legitimate distrust of the marauders of 1914. Could Germany expect to emerge from the war as a first-class colonial or diplomatic power, or even as a fully-favored trading community? I think not.

But is this peace actually no more than a fair register of this world distrust of Germany? Is it a legitimate use of military success in modern Europe, for one Power to pile up against another a series of perquisitions, requisitions, and inquisitions which deprive her of millions of people of her blood and soil, of about half her coal supply and three parts of her iron ore, of all her greater ocean-going marine, of her colonies, of her foreign treaty rights and concessions, of free use of her railways, free disposal of her industrial products, and the effectual right of taxation, which destroy her power to save, and limit her right to work? *Quo warranto?* Who gave this jurisdiction of life and death? What conception of the civilized and the moral order does it advance? Under what banner, either of the old pacific liberalism or of the new international socialism, do its supporting forces move? All fair political ruling rests on an exchange of rights. Under the rule of Paris Germany surrenders every absolute political right of nationhood, including the deep underlying human right of self-respect. She receives nothing. She is defenceless against the least of Powers, or against a harder treaty than this, if it were offered her. Within the period of the treaty she ceases to be self-determined.

It is therefore not only a question of what has been done to Germany under the treaty, but what we who have done it are. The congressmen of Vienna went home with at least one good deed in their wallets. They had settled Europe by consent, as consent was understood in 1815, and thus far at least their treaty was an act of the international conscience. They were conservatives; and they set up the conservative order. It lasted, with radical variations, until 1914. But we of the radical faith, or profession of faith, in reality employ our own principles to confound our enemies, while we seat hers in the bosom of our own League.

This act of fundamental disbelief must react on the future constitution of Europe. The separate deeds of selfishness of which the peace is made up will give the Allies no peace with one another. They must also feel the unrest of their own peoples. The legend of a better world to be won by the war and the treaty had been fixed more firmly in the imagination of millions than any ideal hope of Europe since the Crusades. It has been disappointed. Today those millions realize that substantially there is nothing new, and that if the treaty is to stand for anything more than the extinction of one imperialism by another, the work must be done outside the treaty, or by their own radical amelioration of it. If Germany refuses to sign, this appeasing effort of the democracies of Europe and America will be comparatively simple. They will create the public opinion which has been lacking during the war, and through it the underlying charities of the popular mind will at last appear.

What if Germany signs? In that case power formally recurs to the Governments. There is indeed the League of Nations. But unfortunately the League is just as much a purely governmental weapon as the treaty itself. Indeed, it is in the treaty, not because the treaty is good, but because it is bad and must be made to look good. Without the anodyne of the League, such a draft could never have been commended to European or American liberalism. With it a wraith of a conscience appears, where no true moral act has been willed or accomplished. Force becomes a muffled club, which a respectable policeman may wield. This being the situation, we cannot, even in the event of a German signature, expect an act of true acquiescence. We have not asked for it; it is not in the bond. Supposing, therefore, Germany, signing the treaty, yet meets masked force with masked submission. She may say, "We cannot govern the Germany which your treaty creates—govern you." Europe will then have to deal with a nation of passive resistants. It is not, I think, possible to conceive a non-German administration of Germany, and the mere statement of such a proposition condemns the treaty that sets it forth.

But the reaction of such an appeal on the mind of democratic Europe would be by far its most powerful political effect. It was, I think, always possible for the authors of the covenant to have given it a representative element. The demand for such a change would be irresistible the moment it was seen that the Governments could not settle without the peoples. It is very doubtful whether in any case a single one of the Governments that made the treaty will last. In Britain the economic no less than the political situation points to labor-radicalism as the coming successor to the Coalition. The case for such a Ministry is already strong. Where power is, responsibility should be. But in fact there is now one master-issue in Europe, which is at once the test of our political honesty and the first political reaction of the treaty on western democracy. That is disarmament. It cannot be postponed, and yet no existing Government can settle it. But the new Ministries in Britain, in France, and in Italy will also be free Ministries. They will be free to amend the treaty and the covenant. Above all, they will be free to transfer the control of Mr. Wilson's policy from the League of Armed Governments to the League of Unarmed Nations. Amen.

New York, May 17 H. W. MASSINGHAM

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. The Treaty's Moral Failure

By FELIX ADLER

IT is with a feeling amounting almost to dismay that many thousands of persons in this and other countries have read the constitution of the League of Nations, and the terms of the treaty to be imposed upon the vanquished enemy.

The world is fairly sickened with the horrors of the war through which it has just passed, and men everywhere desire imperatively a settlement which shall prevent, as far as human foresight can avail, the recurrence of such horrors. But the decisions of the Paris Conference insure instead the renewal of wars, and of wars even more desperate than the one just ended. The dissensions among the dominant Powers at the very outset augur ill for future concord even among themselves.

The discontent of certain of the smaller nations with the terms which they are required to accept is palpable, while into the hearts of the vanquished there is now being introduced a burning sense of humiliation and wrong, which must eventually break out into new struggles, unless repressed for decades to come by the continuous application of superior outside military force.

The democracies of England and America are asked to furnish this outside force. Ought they to do so? Democracy hates slavery. It entered the war to put an end to the rule of might. Should it lend itself to bind down with economic chains a whole people, and to reëstablish might on a scale more stupendous than has ever previously been attempted or even contemplated?

It is sometimes said that we must be satisfied with the beginnings of a League of Nations, and trust to future development to improve it. But if it begins with the seeds of mischief in its very constitution, future development can only serve to ripen the evil seeds into full-blown fruition. It is said that half a loaf is better than no bread, and that compromises are unavoidable. But no bread is better than a fraction of a loaf if that fraction contains poison; and compromise, while indispensable as to the means by which policies and principles are effectuated, is wholly inadmissible in respect to the principles themselves. To give way in first-rate matters of principle is not to compromise but to capitulate.

We have studied with anxious scrutiny the decisions of the Paris Conference, over-desirous if possible to be satisfied with them, prepared to find imperfections and mistakes, if only we might discover the promised foundations of a new and better order for mankind. But we find instead the worst features of the old order reproduced: the balance-of-power policy, the bald assertion of the rights of conquest, while new provisions have been written into the covenant that greatly enhance its peril. For it is practically a covenant between five Powers. To five Powers supremacy over the world and all its people is for the time being accorded, and they reserve to themselves, by their majority in the council, the right to determine when and under what conditions, however onerous, the nations now excluded shall be admitted. The five Powers, or their executives, and the agents of their executives, are thus invested with an authority the like of which no prince has ever exercised, and the possible abuse of which no imagination can measure.

The war was fought for democracy as against world domination, and literal world domination by a minority of Governments, not even a minority of peoples is now to be the outcome.

The war was waged in the interests of justice, and among the five Powers who are thus practically made the custodians of universal justice on this planet, disputes have arisen at the outset which reveal that the conception of justice entertained by several among them fails to include the rights of the weak, and is restricted in meaning to an equal division between the strong.

The war profiteering of individuals is rightly censured, but war-profiteering nations are among those intrusted in the new League with the supreme control.

The right of self-determination was announced as a cardinal principle of the new order to be established after this war; alien rule over unwilling populations was to be no longer tolerated. But in Asia, in the Adriatic, and in Central Europe, this principle has been set aside without a qualm. Feeble nations were to be protected against the strong. But when a robber had entered China, had possessed himself of Kiaochow and the wealth of Shantung, and then a neighbor had expelled the robber, the neighbor does not hesitate to claim the best of what the robber had wrongfully appropriated. And yet, with the ancient names of right and truth upon their lips, the makers of these astonishing arrangements ask that they be ratified by the free peoples.

It was announced that the wrong of 1870 must be redressed. A limb had been torn from the body of France, a population had been treated like chattels. Without consulting their wishes, they had been taken out of one political connection and annexed to another, and this on the militarist plea of strategic security, of needful provision to prevent the defeated nation from regaining its own. Fear dictated the wrong committed at that time, and force was employed as the instrument of fear. But now, in the German districts along the Polish frontier, in the valley of the Saar, and elsewhere, the same lamentable mistake is committed once more. Fear dictates the mutilations and the annexations, and force is depended on—the force of the democracies of England and America—to make secure the barriers that fear is building.

And finally, when we consider the punishment of the vanquished enemy, we perceive with a sinking of the heart the same default in application of the principles announced, the same moral insufficiency on the side of the victors. We must be just, it was said, to those to whom we did not wish to be just. But is it just to punish the innocent with the guilty? Is it just to ascribe the crimes of the German rulers, and of those who consciously consented to those crimes, to at least half, nay, more than half, the German people—the women and children, for instance, who had no more voice in deciding what was done, and no more responsibility for what was done, than we had? And yet it is precisely upon the innocent, upon the children especially, that the full brunt will fall of the punitive peace which, under the threat of starvation, the German Government is commanded to sign. It is they who will have to toil with enfeebled strength, and economic resources diminished, for a period no one can foresee how long, to meet the huge indemnities imposed upon them. It is they who will be crushed under the load.

It was said in the beginning that we must distinguish between the masters of Germany and the people, and to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people the appeal was made to disembarrass themselves of their masters. They have done so. But has this fact been allowed to make a difference in our treatment of them? Has not every artifice of propaganda been used to spread distrust of the change that has taken place, in order thereby to justify the harshest measures which the chauvinistic group among their conquerors might dictate?

We were reminded in the beginning that there are two Germanies—Germany a path-finder in science and philosophy, a Germany dear to the lovers of music and the arts, the Germany of Dürer and Beethoven, of Goethe and Kant; and the other a militarist Germany—and that the one was to be destroyed in order that the other might reappear and bring forth again fruit for the elevation of mankind. But has this distinction been remembered?

Germany, the American Secretary of the Navy exultantly said not long ago, is impotent for all time to come. The German people, the English Premier said, is convulsed like a broken-backed creature, crushed in a savage conflict. And yet a people of sixty millions is still a member of the body of humanity; and when one of the members of the body decays the rest must suffer with it, both spiritually and materially. And when a people is rendered impotent, and made to bite the dust in agony, the nobler gifts with which it is endowed perish within it. It ceases then to produce anything in science and the arts which the human family can rejoice in; it is no longer an asset and becomes a canker. Is this a result which the democracies of England and America, which thoughtful men anywhere, desire or can regard with satisfaction?

In view of all these considerations, therefore, I urge upon the Senate of the United States, that whatever other alterations in the covenant of the League may be deemed wise, the following deep-cutting change should receive immediate and supreme consideration; namely that its constitution be so amended as to put the people themselves instead of the Prime Ministers and Executives in control of the League, the delegates to become a true international parliament, with due representation for the working classes of all countries.

Further, I urge that if for the time being Germany and Russia are excluded from the executive council, yet the delegates of their parliaments shall be immediately invited to membership in the international parliament, and that to this parliament be remitted the task of so revising the treaties as to bring them into better accord with those principles of genuine justice which alone can guarantee an enduring peace.

China and Japan

I. A Chinese View

(By Cable to the *Nation*)

Paris, May 17

THE echoes of the passionate and sometimes even savage protests of the Chinese of four continents against the treaty provision giving Shantung to Japan are pouring hourly over the cables to the Chinese delegation in Paris. A mass-meeting of thirty-five thousand in Tsinan threatens with a traitor's death any delegate who agrees to the terms. From another city comes the report of a meeting attended by a hundred thousand persons who urge the uncompromising rejection of the treaty unless the decision is reversed. The Chinese People's Foreign Relations Society, with more than a million members, appeals to the peoples of the Allied countries to support China, adding: "We cannot put our seal to an enactment dooming ourselves, even if the Governments of the Powers wish a return to pre-war conditions." Educational, agricultural, and religious associations representing twenty to thirty millions of people, provincial legislatures, mission schools, chambers of commerce, universities, merchants, and Chinese groups in the United States, the Philippines, Peru, Mexico, England, and France urge that China refuse to sign the treaty. The International Socialist Commission appointed at Berne in February yesterday denounced the Shantung settlement as an "open recognition of the right of conquest."

"The Chinese people are not only astounded, but deeply mortified, by the action of the Council of Three regarding Shantung," said V. K. Wellington Koo, formerly Chinese Ambassador to the United States, and now one of China's delegates to the Peace Conference. "The action of the four thousand Peking students who stormed the home of the Chinese Ambassador to Tokio and assaulted him is probably typical of the intensity of the feeling throughout China. We hardly expected ideal or perfect justice in the settlement, even though it were based on the principles previously declared. The prevailing view in China, however, is that if Fiume offered a case for a firm stand, so much the more does Shantung, whose fate affects a population a thousand times as great, and whose disposition presents no problem of nationality, since the province has always been purely Chinese, and the only Japanese claim is that of conquest. I do not see how the Chinese delegates can accept the decision rendered by the Council of Three without doing violence to the will of the Chinese people. Every effort to modify the decision will be made before the final step is taken."

LEWIS S. GANNETT

II. A Japanese View*

By SHIMPEI GOTO

I AM glad that the Peace Congress has accepted the Japanese contention with regard to the former German possessions in Shantung Province. I have never entertained the slightest doubt as to the intention of the leading Powers at the Peace Conference to deal with the Japanese in the spirit of fair play, because I am convinced of the reasonableness of the stand Japan has taken on the Shantung question.

The Shantung question should not be viewed in the same light as the Fiume question. Japan has never demanded permanent occupation of the former German territory of Kiaochow. On the contrary, she has repeatedly told the world that she would return it to China after it was unconditionally given to her at the Peace Conference. In the agreements which Japan concluded with China in May, 1915, she solemnly pledged herself to the restoration of the German territory to the Chinese Government.

*An address before the Japan Society in New York on May 6.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The so-called secret treaties entered into, in 1917, between Japan and her allies, recognizing her claim to German rights in Shantung, were nothing but a step toward the fulfilment of that pledge which she had given China in the agreement of 1915. In the judgment of the Japanese Government it was necessary for Japan to establish an undisputed right to the German territory before she was in a position to restore it to China. Now that the Peace Congress has granted Japan's wish, I have not the slightest doubt that the Government at Tokio will without delay take steps toward the restoration of Kiaochow to China. Not only will Japan restore it to China, but she will undoubtedly enter into hearty coöperation with the Government and people of China for the development of Shantung Province.

Question has been raised as to the date at which Japan will restore Kiaochow to China. The determination of that question must needs depend upon how soon Japan succeeds in making the necessary arrangements with Germany for the transfer of German rights. In the present unstable condition of the German Government, it is difficult to say whether such arrangements can be made without delay. Moreover, German rights in Shantung are very complicated, and it is not easy to differentiate the rights of the German Government from those of German subjects. The adjustment of these rights must be preceded by careful investigation, which may require considerable time. If Germany signs the Peace Treaty, Japan will immediately enter into negotiations with the German Government, on the one hand, and with the Chinese Government, on the other, so that there will be no unnecessary delay in returning Kiaochow to China.

Japan thinks it not only proper but also necessary that she should first secure these rights from Germany, instead of allowing China to take them directly from that country; first, because they were taken by Japan at considerable sacrifice at the time when China, rent by internal dissension, was powerless to frustrate the German control of Shantung. It would be a reflection upon China's moral sensibility to demand, as she has been demanding, that those rights which she was unable to wrest from Germany be snatched from the hands of Japan unceremoniously and without exhibiting the slightest sense of appreciation for what Japan has done. Second, if China be allowed to deal directly with Germany for the transfer of those rights, the Germans will succeed in driving the better bargain.

There is another factor that should be considered. In undertaking to return Shantung to China, Japan's policy has been influenced by the fear that the Chinese Government may not be able to keep the province—that it may be virtually mortgaged to a third power to the detriment not only of China but also of Japan. We cannot help recalling what happened to South Manchuria after that territory was returned to China by us in 1895. Scarcely was the ink dry upon the treaty conferring that territory upon China, when the district was, to all intents and purposes, surrendered to Russia. Of course, China's foreign relations have since considerably changed, and the possibility of her dismemberment has become much smaller. And yet it cannot be denied that even at present her internal conditions and her international relations are such as to cause intense anxiety to her neighbors, and especially to Japan, which has fortunately managed to escape the foreign yoke which China has been unable to avoid. The country is divided into various factions, each of which is eager to secure foreign assistance for the purpose of entrenching itself against other factions. In its zeal to promote its selfish interests or influence, each faction has often shown itself capable of mortgaging various resources to any foreign nation which may be willing to extend material assistance to it. Who can say that no faction in China will ever be so reckless as to mortgage to a third party those rights which Japan will return to the Government at Peking? Who can gainsay that what has so often happened in China in the past is likely to happen in the future, unless measures are provided against the repetition of such history as the cession of Manchuria to Russia?

In returning Kiaochow to China, Japan will undoubtedly make it plain that she will never acquiesce in the cession of that territory to any third Power or in the arbitrary granting of concessions to foreign nations in the Province of Shantung. I trust that a satisfactory agreement will be effected between China and Japan with a view to preventing such an unfortunate development.

The coming few years will furnish a golden opportunity for the Japanese Government and people to translate into deeds their professed, and I believe sincere, desire to be China's friends and well wishers. I should indeed be deeply disappointed if our Government should fail to rise to the occasion and to prove itself capable of dealing with China in a just, generous, and kindly spirit.

China's greatest need today is educational work. In this urgent work your generous people have blazed the path which should be followed by other nations. You have relinquished your claim to the Boxer indemnity and placed the handsome sum thus realized at the disposal of the Chinese Government for the purpose of facilitating the education of the youth of China. Japan should follow the American example and waive her claim to the Boxer indemnity, asking China to use the fund for the same purpose as that for which the American fund has been used. Our Foreign Department, during my incumbency, seriously considered a proposal to return the Boxer indemnity to China, but the proposal did not materialize, chiefly because the fear was still entertained at that time that the money thus realized by the Chinese Government might be misused for the purpose of conducting war against the South. Yet I hope that the time will soon come when Japan will find it safe and wise to follow the example set by America.

Another undertaking in which Japan must vindicate her friendship toward China is the gradual abolition of ex-territoriality. We have ourselves had a long and bitter experience under the same institution, and we know how to sympathize with our neighbor who is still suffering from it. At the same time we must recognize that it is impracticable to abolish ex-territoriality so long as China has no modern laws and no efficient courts to administer them. In this matter China would do well to follow the example of Japan. In this difficult undertaking, upon which China must soon embark, Japan would consider it a privilege to be of some service to China. We wish to be the first nation to endorse China's desire to put an end to the inequitable, though hitherto inevitable, institution which has so long hurt not only the pride but the interests of China. This task before China and Japan is a great task beset with difficulties, fraught with dangers and likely to provoke international complications. And yet we venture to think that the spirit of the new era which has dawned upon the world will not long permit the perpetuation of a political system which seems obviously contrary to that spirit.

BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III. An American View

By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS

IT is conceded that Japan has won a diplomatic victory at Paris. In being made Germany's residuary legatee at Kiaochow, she will, it is believed, largely "control the Orient." Yet how? If a real victor, she may well heed the maxim of her greatest constructive statesman. After the decisive battle of Sekigahara, in October, 1600, Iyeyasu uttered the maxim, "After victory, knot the cords of your helmet." Suiting the action to the word, he tied anew the straps of his head gear. Then, with unsleeping vigilance and unsurpassed diligence, he proved himself even a greater statesman than a warrior. His system gave war-torn Japan peace for a quarter of a millennium. Japan's triumph of 1919 consists in her ability, above all other nations, because of propinquity and long preparation, to tap the resources of China and to control the trade routes to western Asia and Europe.

Yet despite the military and naval power of Japan, with its horrible burden of taxation, the supremacy of the Japanese is most likely to be maintained by what they themselves call "brain-victories." Japan's position is certain to be endangered more by her own folly than by the jealousy of rivals or the open hostility of enemies. Internal causes of weakness, already apparent, may soon turn what now seems victory into national disaster. It is along the paths of justice and righteousness, rather than the broad avenues of imperialistic militarism, that Japan must proceed if she is to maintain her own noblest traditions. Unless the militaristic features of her Bushido, or the War Man's Philosophy, give way to the new and expanding ideals of Heimindo, that is, Peaceful and Enlightened Democracy, both the Throne and Japan's hard-won position in the world are doomed. The fate of her Heiké, her Hojo, and her Tokugawa may yet be that of her modern militaristic bureaucracy. This mighty machine, which rears its menacing head between the sovereign and his people, as surely as did the old Russian oligarchy, may well profit by recent example. It is this legacy from the old military caste in Japan that keeps alive the spirit of feudalism, after the form has departed. Nor can any brilliant feat in foreign policy much longer hide the internal trend of fact and opinion, or stay the eternal law of cause and effect. For Japan, in this age of the world, to cling to the old notions, bred of the sword and of military force, in trying to rule her own and her conquered people, is a reversion to mediævalism.

In fact and truth, the day has gone by when any Government dare resent as "interference with its domestic concerns" the protest of civilization against such atrocities as Japan permits in Korea. The brutalities of her underlings in that country, whose venerable civilization is menaced with destruction, can no longer be concealed. As for the Tokio Government, or any of its literary bureaus, attempting a camouflage, that is impossible even with a censorship that is like that of a blockaded enemy country in time of war. The united testimony of many witnesses, long resident in the land of Morning Calm, speaking the vernacular and beholding deeds which they have associated hitherto only with the worst brutalities of war, will, in the end, outweigh the moral value of official bulletins or even annual publication of "reforms."

Japan is playing a losing game when, in these days of democracy, she strives to buttress the Throne with fairy tales and nursery myths. When she silences or removes the scholars who examine history critically, or, from Shinto's own records, show the absurdity of that pseudo-Mikadoism on which militaristic and bureaucratic parasites feed, she reverts again to mediævalism. The same hateful policy holds in Korea, when she virtually prohibits to Koreans any teaching above the elementary branches, and prescribes what, and what alone, Korean youth may study in Japan. Her military conscription is in some respects a magnificent method of uniting her own people; but when soldiers from remote islands, mountain regions, and other places notably backward in civilization, are allowed to handle unarmed mobs in Korea, the result is that both religious rancor and primitive brutality have sway.

It is freely granted that the presence of so powerful and even disturbing an element as that of a large body of alien teachers, all of them from English-speaking nations, may be a hindrance to Japanese ideals and policy. These were on the ground for a generation before the Japanese. Yet two incontestable facts remain. The first is, that Ito, a genuine statesman, was able to work in the spirit of co-operation; and the second is, that not far away, in the Philippines, is a startling contrast in methods. In neither region will the public opinion of the world tolerate the methods of the division commander with his machine guns, instead of the patience and practice of real statesmanship. If the Japanese retort to the American critic of her ways, or if the Philippines, Hawaii, and Porto Rico be brought into the discussion, the answers are on the surface, and at the same time they run deep down in history. To no other country on earth is Japan indebted as to Korea, from whose neighboring shores nearly all that we call civilization overflowed during the early centuries. The story of human life on this planet affords few nobler precedents than the altruism of the Korean missionaries, envoys, artists, architects, and intellectuals, who found primitive Nippon in unlettered barbarism and left it covered with the symbols of religion and the monuments of civilization.

Nevertheless, even the worst indictments published by the protesting Koreans on American soil do not equal some that may be heard in Japan. We have hope of Japan's amendment of both spirit and method, for the social conscience of that country is awakening. Every signature which Japan has given to treaties, from Fillmore-Perry days to these of the world league, binds her to new moral sanctions, and in each case she has made advance, despite her lapse in adopting for a time imperialistic ways. Will she now fail in Korea? Will she disappoint her own people, who have outgrown Bushido—white flower though it was of feudal culture? The world, in granting membership in its parliament and sanctioning Japan's hold on the Asian mainland, expects far more of her. She must hide nothing, and must sail always under true colors. It is hers now to encourage and reinforce those new ethical influences which are slowly transforming the mind of her people, but to which the attitude of the military and bureaucracy is decidedly opposed. Better, we should say, heed the enlightened voices in the new Japan—voices which, far more than any war successes on land or water, have made her what she is.

So far, the perspective inspires hope. Knowing well the internal intellectual forces, without which Perry's peaceful armada of 1852 would have been a total and costly failure,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I believe that there is a potency of moral reform in Japan which in the long run will exceed that of machine guns, depth bombs, or poison gas. Space does not permit, at this point, a review of the long procession of moral forces and their phenomenal results that have re-created the empire of Iyeyasu and Mutsuhito. Of these, happily, more than one living American has been the actual witness. Yet it is certain that among the dozen or fewer aliens who have sifted Japanese history, there is unanimity in the belief that it is the ideas, the moral enlightenment, and the resultant of ethical forces from within and from without that, far more than triumphs in war, have nourished the real Japan, "the child of the world's old age." Nor do I doubt that this same union of what is best in both Orient and Occident will yet establish righteousness in Korea, while reaffirming the sanctions that have kept inviolate the sway of the oldest line of rulers known on earth.

Foreign Correspondence

Four Capitals

Berlin, April 16

I HAVE now seen four mid-European capitals laboring in the throes of recovery from the war. Each one of them presents a totally distinct psychological aspect. Vienna is the great shell of a once mighty empire now reduced to the size of a principality. The dignity of ages and the grandeur of generations of empire still grace Vienna. But the streets are empty and disconsolate; the only crowds are at the food shops where people are lined up to get their rations. Ten o'clock sees the Kerntnerstrasse dead. A few rusty cabs and a few rickety autos during the daytime tour the streets. The Czechs are already transferring the Viennese autos to Prague through barter of food and coal for horsepower. Visibly a great capital is crumbling. Indeed, this problem of the city is going to be as acute in Europe as it was in our Middle West when the railways were being built. The town that got the railway station fattened, and the town that didn't, shrivelled up. Similarly, the new distribution of nations will be the making and unmaking of European cities. Vienna may shrink to a provincial capital and Prague grow to be a metropolis. The same story will be told of Budapest, except that Budapest is now inspired, or was until recently, with the fire of an ideal and so thought not of material ruin. Or will it be possible for a city like Vienna to go on existing without any hinterland or any tributary commerce? A strange thing it would be if this agglomeration of two million people could and would continue living agglomerated because of lack of centripetal force. As yet the Viennese go on just as if they were always going to live together by taking in each other's washing. They are starving and despondent. But they do not think of going elsewhere, except the Jews, who all thing of emigrating. There has been a scheme hatched by the Government for the settlement of former Austrian officers on land in Argentina. Whoever knows the nature and training of Austrian officers can scarcely take this proposal with seriousness.

At any rate, Vienna and the Viennese make at present a unique picture. For the Viennese are not a belligerent race. Give them each day their coffee and cream and their cakes and their beer, with a few hours at the café and a few at the theatre, and your Viennese will never turn Bolshevik. But your Berlin man is entirely different. In Berlin the atmosphere is electric with bitterness and protest. Even the middle classes mock at the present Government, which neither carries out social reform nor improves the food situation. This may be said also of the Viennese Government. But the people of Austria have become accustomed to making a joke of poor government. The Germans have never known what inefficient government means, so that now they notice the *Schlamperei*. The same old bureaucrats still sit in the departments and rule the country. And the petty officials are as dictatorial as ever. Nothing of any account gets socialized. No really liberal measures are introduced. Instead, Berlin is plastered all over with smug appeals to the workingmen to work so as to escape starvation. This is not a platform on which a Government can long travel. Even people of the middle classes, people who do not believe in socialism, tell you that a little Bolshevism would do Germany good.

Yesterday and today the strike of the *Angestellten*, the employees whom the socialists call the "white collar proletariat," is taking place. All the big shops are closed. And the signs on Wertheim's, telling the public that all *arbeitslustige* employees will be welcome, call in vain. A great fear exists that the strike may spread to the railroads. These seem now threatened with paralysis, on account of the coal strike in the Ruhr regions. Many passenger trains have already been laid off. The Government threatens to stop all passenger service if the coal supply continues to dwindle. So everybody is trying to get out of Berlin. At the ticket offices stand long queues of people waiting for tickets and for permission to travel. You cannot now leave Berlin unless you give a good reason for your journey. The casualties among country relatives, therefore, are just now reaching enormous proportions. The trains out of Berlin are jammed to subway capacity. You have to be at the station two hours before train time. The food situation has improved somewhat and is far better than the situation in Vienna. The population has cause to complain of undernourishment. Yet I think that starvation in Berlin has not reached the depths that it has reached in Austria. Those who have never been forced to eat half-cooked cabbage three times a day do not know what suffering is. Now that I have shaken off the dust of Vienna I shall never want to sit at table again in company with cabbage of any variety.

In general the impression of Berlin is that of a city angered against its own rulers more than against its conquerors. This spirit is said to prevail throughout the country. In other of the German states it is aggravated by the feeling that the Prussians are being used as invaders to put down local uprisings. One does not often like to rely upon a night clerk in a hotel, especially when the night clerk is at the same time porter and boots, for one's political judgment on local conditions. But the night clerk in a Dresden hotel told me with a certain amount of pride that the Saxons had thrown their War Minister into the Elbe and then riddled him full of holes. "And," he complained, "now these Preussische troops come here to Dresden to put down our riots. Why don't they stay at home and let us attend to our own troubles?" I think the spirit of separatism is working in favor of communism.

In general, the German Government is drifting, much like that of Vienna. Only in Germany the radical leaders seem prepared to take the responsibility for communism, while in Vienna such men as Friedrich Adler do not. For in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vienna the responsibility that Bolshevism would bring with it would be starvation direct. The Allies would stop the thin stream of food from Trieste that keeps Vienna alive.

It is also interesting to note that the bourgeois German newspapers print the same preposterous lies about the Munich communists that the Viennese bourgeois press did about the Hungarian Bolsheviki. Having been in Budapest myself directly after the revolution, I know that the Austrian newspapers lied. And so I conclude that the German bourgeois press did likewise. I am also informed by an eye-witness that this same press lied most horribly about the Spartacan uprisings and proceedings.

I do not, however, wish to imply that Germany will turn Bolshevik. The Government seems to have enough troops to go scurrying around from place to place putting out the local conflagrations—unless these become too numerous. But a government that relies purely on force and has no real programme cannot last long.

Prague, April 20

At Prague the situation continues to improve. American food, two barges at a time, comes streaming up the Elbe. And the general tone is consequently more optimistic. Easter proved a gay festival. The streets were bright with the costumes of peasant girls and boys who came in to celebrate. Like all the other mid-European Governments which started out to be radical and socialistic, the Government here is slumping back into liberalism. The land law that was passed recently, laying down the principle that the large estates should be expropriated, is a moderate measure and will not hit the middle-class farmer at all, and no provisions for the carrying out of the principles set down in the law are made. The general opinion holds that a year at least must elapse before anything can be done in this matter of expropriation, and even then it will not be in the direction of communization, but in the contrary direction. A host of small-landed proprietors will thus be created.

The left socialists do not approve of this law. Stivin is the leader of these, the Bolshevist group. Modracek stands at the right; he and his colleagues really constitute a radical liberal party. In between are socialists of all colors. At the coming elections of officers for communities the test of strength will come. Generally the opinion is expressed that the two Socialist parties, the National Socialists and the Social Democrats, will gain a majority over the Agrarians, the Bourgeois, and the Clericals. But that will somewhat depend on the peace terms and what happens in the interval. Of thorough-going communism there is at present no possibility. People are doing too well in Prague now, and the nationalist spirit is too strong. However, the Social Democratic party, whose leader Stivin is, feels closely allied to communism. Stivin is said to have received wireless messages from Bela Kun from Budapest, and the other day he rose in Parliament and vehemently denounced the use of Czech troops against the Hungarians, demanding at the same time their return from Hungary and from Russia as well. Nevertheless there are pretty well-founded reports that conflicts are taking place in the neighborhood of Kassau, on the eastern Czecho-Hungarian frontier. An important railway line leads through the Carpathians to the Ukraine, but first passes a small triangle of Hungarian territory. In order to consolidate the front against Russian Bolshevism the Allies would have to hold this pass.

HENRY G. ALSBERG

Recent Irish Poetry

By PADRAIC COLUM

WHETHER it has or has not to do with the prosaic issue of self-determination, Irish poetry in these latter days is becoming more and not less national—but not in the way that Davis tried to make it national:

> Strongbow's force, and Henry's wile,
> Tudor's wrath and Stuart's guile,
> And iron Strafford's tiger jaws,
> And brutal Brunswick's penal laws;
> Not forgetting Saxon faith,
> Not forgetting Norman scathe,
> Not forgetting William's word,
> Not forgetting Cromwell's sword.

No, Irish poetry is no longer national in such a claimant way. But it is becoming national as the Irish landscape is national, as the tone or gesture of the Irish peasant is national. Indeed, since the time of Yeats's beginnings, Irish poetry is becoming closer to the landscape and closer to the mind of the people.

Take, for example, Joseph Campbell's "Earth of Cualann." What is said in it about the national claim is in hidden words. But in almost every poem the Irish landscape is revealed, and some shadow or some ray upon the landscape reminds us of ancient romance:

> In the youth of Summer
> The hills of Cualann
> Are two golden horns,
> Two breasts of childing,
> Two tents of light.
>
> In the ancient winter
> They are two rusted swords,
> Two waves of darkness,
> Two moons of ice.

An ancient Gaelic poet might have made such a double triad, and thus the hills are drawn back to times of the Sagas. And in the poem "Loch Donn" the poet of today surrounds a lonely lake with the shadows of old poets who gave beautiful names to the waters of Ireland:

> *Beauty has brought me many lovers,*
> *But only to you have I given love.*
>
> Your eyes are moonbows,
> Your breasts, white sands,
> Your thoughts,
> Fishes leaping from the silence of brown water.
> Tell me your secret,
> For love is a secret unmasked.
>
> *I am old.*
>
> Old?—
> This rowan mouth?
> This sedge-dark hair?
> These mists folding you as a queen is folded?
> These lilies at your feet?
>
> *Older than Cailleach Bhera,*
> *Who knew seven tides of life.*
> *I have known but one, and it has never ebbed:*
> *A stream poured out*
> *From Cradle Top,*
> *By the Cold Inches and the Ford of Cows,*
> *Into the heart of Tethra's Cauldron.*
> *I cannot die.*
>
> As beauty cannot.
>
> *Nor as love.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In many of the poems a portion of the effect is gained by the imaginative use of Gaelic names. Mr. Campbell never uses Gaelic names, as Mr. Yeats has often used them, without consideration, not only for their meaning, but for the esoteric tradition that is bound up in them. He is the only one of the Irish poets who has taken to modern verse forms. As can be seen from the splendid invocation "At Dawn," and the descriptive poem "At a Time of a Great Wind," he uses irregular unrhymed verse with fine and subtle power.

"The Rosses" and "An Epilogue" by Seumas O'Sullivan, are, alack! both slight in volume, and one misses in them certain of the distinctive qualities that are in this poet's other books—a subtle rhythmic quality such as is in his best-known lyric, "O Herdsman, driving your slow twilight flock," and a delicate humor such as is in his "Nelson Street." But there is one poem in "The Rosses" that will be placed with the poet's best—"In Memoriam: S. MacD." It is one of the very finest of the Irish lamentations. The little volume is marked "passed by Censor," and yet this cry over an executed revolutionist is permitted to stand. Verily, the ways of Dublin Castle pass comprehension. Here is the poem:

They have slain you, Sean MacDiarmuid; never more these eyes will greet,
The eyes beloved by women, and the smile that true men loved.
Never more I'll hear the stick-tap, and the gay and limping feet,
They have slain you, Sean the gentle, Sean the valiant, Sean the proved.

Have you scorn for us who linger here behind you, Sean the wise?
As you look about and greet your comrades in the strange new dawn.
So one says, but, saying, wrongs you, for doubt never dimmed your eyes,
And not death itself could make those lips of yours grow bitter, Sean.

As your stick goes tapping down the heavenly pavement, Sean, my friend,
That is not your way of thinking, generous, tender, wise and brave;
We, who knew and loved and trusted you, are trusted to the end,
And your hand even now grips mine as though there never were a grave.

In "An Epilogue" there is a poem of Faery, "The Others," that is haunting—it gives one the sense of a folk bespelled:

And then the dream forsakes them
And sighing, they turn anew
As the whispering music takes them
To the dance of the elfin crew.

Oh, many a thrush and blackbird
Would fall to the dewy ground,
And pine away in silence
For envy of such sound.

So the night through
In our sad pleasure,
We dance to many a measure
That earth never knew.

Seumas O'Sullivan is one of the poets who cherishes an ancient privilege of the craft—the privilege of singing out his scorn. There is a section in the little volume, "The Rosses," marked "Invectives." "Dublin Castle," "Collectiors —1913," "Traitor's Gate," "On a Maligning Friend" have a tonic bitterness.

Outside of Ireland it may be regarded as remarkable that separatist Ulster should produce the poetry of militant Irish nationalism. It has produced it already in the poetry of Alice Milligan. And now there is Florence M. Wilson bringing the flame out of the "Black North." There is something that recalls Moira O'Neill and something that recalls Alice Milligan in the poems in the pamphlet entitled "The Coming of the Earls." But in their winsome Ulster dialect, with their imaginative patriotism and their touch of the eerie, these poems are altogether distinctive. No one in Ireland has written a ballad like the one that gives title to the book, or like "The Man from God Knows Where." I should like to quote "The Green Riders," but a poem of Faery has already been quoted. This particular poem has the real lilt of peasant speech—a lilt that saves it from an effect of intentional weirdness. Too often, in poems of fairy hauntings we are more aware of the intention than of the spell. The poem I will quote from Florence Wilson is "The Whins":

The whin is out afore the short day's turnin';
Och, but the whin is brave!
It sets a ring of fairy candles burnin'
Roun' dour Winter's grave.

The whin is out when nothin' else is showin',
Along the dreepin' ditch;
But, God above, He better loves its growin'
Than the red roses o' the rich.

The whin is out when ne'er a bird is singin'
The bare, wet fields across,
And in the grey mists that the winds be bringin'
Its golden torches toss.

The whin is out, upon bare lonesome places
You'll see its splendours flung,
Then, thank God, for the whin, an' the wee childers' faces,
That keep the ould land young.

There is something about this little book that is friendly and ardent, like the gorse on the Ulster fields—or, in the speech of Ulster, the whins.

Of the poets killed in the war Francis Ledwidge has had the least said about him, but I think it is possible that the most will be thought about him in the end. His is hardly personal poetry. As we read it we feel that we might have dreamt the phrases he uses in his verses, or we might have heard them spoken by someone we met upon a road. How easily natural images arise in his poetry:

She came unto the hills and saw the change
That brings the swallow and the geese in turn.

"Songs of Peace," his second volume, was put together while Francis Ledwidge was still in life. And what he saw in places that the war brought him to were the sheep coming home in Greece and the rose torn from its briar in Serbia. The poems entitled "In Barracks" and "In Camp" are mostly made up of memories of places and people in Ireland:

And when the war is over I shall take
My lute a-down to it and sing again
Songs of the whispering things amongst the brake.

One of his latest, as it was the longest and most ambitious of his poems, "The Lannan Shee," written in interlinear rhymed verse derived from a Gaelic form, is not included in this collection. But there are many short pieces in which his mastery of a simple and musical verse-form produces an exquisite effect—as this, called "The Herons":

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As I was climbing Ardan Mór
From the shore of Sheelin lake,
I met the herons coming down
Before the water's wake.

And they were talking in their flight
Of dreamy ways the herons go
When all the hills are withered up
Nor any waters flow.

One might compare this with a poem already quoted—Mr. Campbell's "The Hills of Cualann." Each has the clear execution of a Japanese design.

The fate of certain Irish poets, friends of his, moved Francis Ledwidge to make some tender memorials in that distinctively Gaelic verse form which he was attaining to mastery in. Lord Dunsany says of these poems: "Rather than attribute curious sympathies to a brave young Irish soldier I would ask his readers to consider the irresistible attraction that a lost cause has for almost any Irishman." Which is a foolish remark for a wise man to have made.

Crawford Howell Toy

By SAMUEL McCHORD CROTHERS

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD HOWELL TOY, who died in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on May 12, was born in 1836. With the exception of two years, when he served in the Confederate Army, his life was that of a scholar devoted to one subject. A Southern Baptist, he became the foremost Old Testament scholar in his church, and exercised a wide influence as a teacher. In 1879 he became conscious of his divergence from the orthodox creeds, and resigned his professorship in the Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville. In 1880 he became professor of Hebrew and other Oriental languages in the Harvard Divinity School, and since that time his fame has been connected with that institution.

Every branch of human culture has its heroic age, when the scholar must have courage and the spirit of adventure as well as industry. Mere erudition is not enough, there must be a large supply of mother wit. There must also be the power to see the real relations between the new learning and the old. It was in such a transition period that Dr. Toy lived and wrought.

His chosen vocation was that of a truth-teller in regard to the history of religion. For this important function he was admirably fitted. By nature and training he was religious, and was thereby saved from the fate of so many scholars who have but an imperfect sympathy with the subject which they undertake to treat. Dr. Toy had a singular freedom not only from prejudice, but from partiality for his own theories. He said, "I have spoken plainly, yet never, I hope, irreverently. My aim has been to state what I hold to be the exact truth." This passion for exactitude, not too common among professional teachers of religion, gave Dr. Toy's work a rare distinction. He was the sworn foe of pious obscurantism. In his treatment of the Bible he was careful that the student should get the precise meaning of the original. He was not deterred by the charge of "destructive criticism." His method was so clear and his language so transparent that works written by a scholar for scholars could be read with pleasure by any one who cared for the subject. His book on "Quotations from the Old Testament in the New Testament" has nothing unattractive but the title. It has the fascination that always belongs to a bit of intellectual work that has been done by a master.

In his "Introduction to the History of Religion," Dr. Toy's superb common-sense showed itself at every turn, and often had the effect of wit. Anthropologists are usually very solemn in their treatment of that creature of their scientific imagination, the "primitive man." To reconstruct religion or morality from such fragments as the forgotten peoples left behind them in their kitchen middens is no easy task. A vast collection of facts about early cults, taboos, totems, and tribal lays may be made. But what did they mean? What did all these things have to do with religion? Mere erudition cannot answer such questions.

Dr. Toy, with his quick wit and instinctive sympathy, was a good guide through this jungle. When he did not see the way, he was not ashamed to say so. He had a way of making primitive man seem quite human. He could not always explain his behavior, but he was not ashamed to prefer an intelligible motive to one that was unintelligible. "The savage is not without discrimination. He is quite capable of discriminating between the living and the dead. He is a practical thinker, and deals with each phenomenon as it presents itself for him." Among the marriage customs of primitive tribes there is that of the bride trying to escape from the bridegroom. Dr. Toy tells of the various learned theories connecting it with the still more primitive marriage by capture. After gravely considering these theories he adds his own: "Perhaps it may have been merely an occasion for fun for the young people." Dr. Toy's study of "Taboo and Morality" has a contemporary interest. The clever young people who when they break a taboo feel that they have accomplished a mighty feat, might find it worth while to ask whether taboos are always without reason. Dr. Toy would remind them that they should exercise a little discrimination.

There is an aspect of Dr. Toy's career that must occur to those who are interested in the distribution of scholarly ability in the United States. He was in many respects a typical Southerner, whose manners kept alive the great tradition of the gentleman and scholar. One could not meet him without being reminded of the charm of Virginia, South Carolina, and Kentucky. That the church in the South lost him in his intellectual prime is a part of the price which it paid for its theological solidarity. That it nurtured such a fine, free spirit and enlisted it in the service of religion is testimony to its vitality and a promise of its future. There is evidence that a man like Dr. Toy would now find a larger opportunity and truer appreciation among his own people than was possible in 1880.

Contributors to this Issue

H. W. MASSINGHAM, editor of the London *Nation*, is one of England's foremost liberal journalists.

FELIX ADLER, founder of the Ethical Society, has long been a leader in American social thought.

BARON GOTO was Minister of Communications in the second Katsura Cabinet, and Minister of the Interior and later of Foreign Affairs under Count Terauchi, predecessor of the present Japanese Premier.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, for many years engaged in educational work in Japan, is one of the leading American authorities on Far Eastern affairs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shantung*

By WITTER BYNNER

IN the west you free Jerusalem,
But in the east you sell
T'ai Shan, the Holy Mountain.
I hear a temple bell
Breathing, like a perfume,
From its exalted place
The presence of Confucius,
The wisdom of a race,
The future of a people,
The only one of all
Whose conquerors are conquered,
Whose history is tall—
Taller than Fujiyama,
Taller than Koyasan,
Taller than that red sun
Consuming from Japan . . .
And my face is in the flowers,
And my brow is in the dust,
And my heart is sick with perfume
And I weep because I must;
I weep for you, O masters,
O conquerors, O slaves,
As I hear you stir in China
The quiet of your graves.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter is moved at learning that the great C-5 has joined the Brotherhood of Drifters, and has disowned man as his master. The hand of man created this flying giant, but the winds of heaven have given it a soul. And such a creation of the air we would fetter with the name "Dirigible"! It smacks of the condescension with which we complacently refer to "subject-peoples." But neither the belittling "Dirigible" nor the even more insulting term, "Blimp," can shape destiny in this day of self-determination. We may try to keep public opinion in the dirigible class, mooring it by proved doctrines till official pilots chart out the approved line of flight. To advocates of such intellectual caution the Drifter would recommend the C-5—unwieldy, perhaps, unschooled, impatient, but venturing all in its quest for freedom. Failure? Who knows? The docile couriers which thread the heavens only by appointed lanes, may never cross its orbit, but romantic spirits roving wide may glimpse its fearless flight. Already it is a myth, touched with the gleam of icebergs and the mist of clouds; but the C-5 shall be no ominous wraith, like the Flying Dutchman, doomed to spread disaster over endless seas; no haunter of battlefields like the sky-riding Valkyrie; but the winged messenger of freedom.

* * * * *

DODECANESUS! It has a sweet lisping sound on the lips of an impassioned Greek, but to the Drifter, who learned his geography from a classical atlas, it is but a parvenu name for a familiar group of Ægean islands. Yet he cannot blame the Greeks for clinging romantically to these rocky islets. Were not the people of Cos the allies of the Greeks in the Trojan War? And need Hellenes cede to descendants of mere Romans the vineyards (whose oft-sung wines the Drifter has only one more month to praise); the perfumes, whose fragrance steals faintly across the ages; the dyes that lent enchantment to famed transparent Coän garments? It may be that the rival claimants of today are more concerned with the dried currants with which the prudent husbandman heaps his upper chamber; or the sponges which tempt the diver to the reefs. The Drifter, who as a schoolboy was the proud owner of a sponge, attached to his slate, while the rest of the class were still dependent on wet fingers or an overworked sleeve, was interested in sponges, and a Greek friend did him the honors of his London warehouse. Sponges, sponges, sponges—in boxes, cases, crates, filled rooms, lofts, buildings.

* * * * *

OF all the treasures of Cos and her sister isles, the most priceless is the memory of Theocritus, strolling with his friends across the noontide hills to the harvest feast at the farm of Phrasidenus. There it was that they overtook the goatherder Lycidas, and vied with him in song, until the day's end brought them to the orchards where

> The breath of the rich summer was abroad,
> And filled the air with scent of ripening fruits.
> The apples rolled beside us in the grass,
> The pears were lying at our feet, and plums
> Bent down the tender branches of the trees;
> The four years' seal was loosened from the jar.

The would-be owners, Latin and Greek, of these haunts of the nymphs might leave the awarding of the prize to Pan, rather than to Paris. And in bidding for his favor let them remember the appeal and warning of Theocritus:

> And oh, dear Pan!
> If thou do this; may no Arcadian boys
> Come with their stinging rods to flog thy sides
> And shoulders, when they see too small a share
> Of meats for them upon thine altar left.
> But if thou shouldst decide another way,
> Then may thy skin be torn and scratched with nails.

* * * * *

THE Drifter was gratified to learn from Mr. Massingham that the British weekly which he edits with such distinction was really named for the American *Nation*. Most of us are flattered to have our names perpetuated. What patriotic citizen is not gratified by each new Boulevard Président Wilson—even if an occasional one does relapse into Fiume street? We may soon hear of a Place de Kolchak—Woodrowsky. But there are those who appear to resent sharing their names with natives of other lands. At least a Brooklyn judge is jealous for his neighbors lest the dropping of a *sky* be as disastrous to them as it was to Chicken-Little. If your name be Kannofsky you may not simplify it to Kenyon if you live in Brooklyn. (It is three Administrations since simplified spelling was official.) The Drifter would be sorry to see all foreign nomenclature exalted to a monotone of Brooklyn respectability. He bitterly resents the efficiency of his ancestors who curtailed their melodious name of Sevenoak to the time-saving Snook. If we must lose our native terminology, it is at least something to save the vestigial structures. This aid to the genealogist was entirely lost sight of by the Drifter's newly arrived Greek friend, who scrapped his sonorous "Herakles Athanasopoulos" and achieved Americanization as Frank Thompson. THE DRIFTER

*In Shantung Confucius was born and died, and there still lives his descendant in the seventy-sixth generation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Here's Hoping

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I enclose my check for another year's subscription to the *Nation*. The habit of thirty-five years is not easily broken, and moreover I am promising myself the pleasure of witnessing the crash when the *Nation* goes on the rocks towards which it has been headed since the beginning of its pro-German, pro-Bolshevist, and pro-pious (this last is an especially original and diverting feature) editorial policy.

Boston, May 7 A. L. P. WILLIAMS

Japanese Immigration

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Having just returned from Japan, it is a pleasure to find a paper treating this moral question of Japanese immigration in the way you do. It seems to me we cannot much longer, with honor, ignore this question at issue between us, nor continue to place the Japanese in the position of inferiors.

Is it true that the Japanese Government will not allow its people to become American citizens, or if they do that they can never return to Japan? We should know all the facts in the case. The feudalistic loyalty of the Japanese to their Government may largely prevent their wishing to become citizens of this country. It is not easy for those who come here to understand our ideals, for they are only fifty years away from feudal days.

As a resident of Japan for many years, and a friend and admirer of their many fine qualities, this question interests me deeply. I feel it is the duty of our papers to educate our people in the subject and make them realize that it is now up for settlement and can only be settled in one way.

Peterborough, N. H., May 17 V. T. LINDSLEY

Stuart's Portraits of Washington

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: At the present time there appears to be, on the part of buyers and dealers, a striking revival of interest in American portraiture. Especially is this true of the paintings by Gilbert Stuart. The rapidity and regularity with which the market is supplied with Stuart's portraits of Washington, to mention no others, is little short of amazing. While the supply may be expected to keep pace with the demand, the passage, cited below, from a letter of Miss Jane Stuart, daughter of the painter, dated July 22, 1876, printed at the end of the thirty-fifth report, *Boston Town Records*, cannot fail to be of interest to the admirers of this master of portraiture.

"The picture of Washington now in Faneuil Hall was painted by my father, Gilbert Stuart, and presented to the Town of Boston by Samuel Parkman. This circumstance is too much impressed on my mind to admit of any doubt whatever. Also that it was copied from the original head now in the Athenæum. Now, my dear sir, if you will take the trouble to read the July number of *Scribner's Monthly* (vol. xii., 1876, p. 367) you will find an authentic history of the Washington Portraits, written by myself. You will there see that my father never finished but two heads of the great patriot. Permit me to add that my father never put his name to any picture he ever painted in his life."

"Of these originals," his biographer says, "Stuart made twenty-six copies." Miss Jane Stuart, who was herself an artist, died some thirty years ago, at an advanced age, at Newport, Rhode Island.

Amherst, Mass., May 8 FREDERICK TUCKERMAN

Zealous Epirotes

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Albanian writer, in the *Nation* of May 3, doubts the statement of Mr. Venizelos relative to the Greek nationality of the 120,000 Christians of Northern Epirus. If we Northern Epirotes were not Greeks, but Albanians, why did we revolt in 1914 against Albania? Why did we fight nearly nine months? Why did the Great Powers in the Protocol of Corfu give us an autonomous government, with the Greek language in our schools and in our state?

Let the Italian troops move out of Northern Epirus and allow our people to vote. Nearly all the Christians will vote for union with Greece.

Boston, May 7 N. S. CASSAVETES

The Old Order Revived

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In answer to certain statements in General Oberoutcheff's recent letter, may I say that it has become the fashion in the past few weeks to extol General Kolchak as the incarnation of democracy? Nevertheless Kolchak represents all that the old order represented, and the statements made about him in Professor Lomonossoff's article are true.

Corporal punishment is used by Kolchak, not only on soldiers, but as a general policy of discipline throughout his domain. He resorted to public whippings in punishing recalcitrant railway employees. Distilling of vodka is the main revenue of Kolchak's régime, and any attempt to justify this policy by saying that all Americans are not for prohibition does not carry much weight in view of the fact that the distilling of vodka in Siberia means not only the demoralization of the people but the destruction of food supplies needed by a starving population.

Kolchak's main support is among that same ultra anti-Semitic element which was responsible for Jewish massacres in old Russia, and the Siberian Government so-called, discriminates against Jews in the true old-fashioned Czarist manner.

New York, May 19 S. NUORTEVA

A Melancholy Deficiency

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Is there not something fine in the way some Americans respond to their country's need? Is it not thrilling to read how two Americans, stirred by the playing of the two Russians, Rachmaninoff and Heifetz, subscribed $1,200,000 and $500,000, respectively, to the Fifth Liberty Loan? Unfortunately, not all Americans have been equally patriotic. The working people have fallen far short of rising to the occasion. Perhaps it is because they lack breeding and are not gentlemen; perhaps for more subtle reasons.

Every time the Government asks for money, a prominent Boston manufacturer responds with, "I'll take a million." He doesn't even stop to see if he has the money in his pocket or to consult with his wife as to whether the doctor has been paid for the last baby. As soon as he learns that there is a new loan, he just says, in a mechanical way, "I'll take a million, and, if one isn't enough, I'll take two." What a splendid example he and the others with their million-dollar subscriptions set for the workers! I thought that some patriot of the pick and shovel would surely take a million, too; some school teacher, lumber jack, hotel porter, carpenter, riveter, blacksmith, college professor, dish washer, longshoreman, or some other worker would refuse to be outdone by these employers. But the sad fact to be recorded is that not one single American workingman has been patriotic enough to subscribe $1,000,000 for his country's bonds!

Roslindale, Mass., May 8 WALTER C. HUNTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

"Lion's" Letters

Life and Letters of Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker. Based on Materials Collected and Arranged by Lady Hooker. By Leonard Huxley. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

IN the history of thought the outstanding contribution of the nineteenth century was the Darwinian theory of organic evolution through natural selection. For making this theory an integral part and parcel of the world's intellectual stock in trade three men, Darwin, Huxley, and Hooker, were primarily responsible. They were a great group. Measured even by the most exacting standards of the present-day sporting editor, their team play was nearly perfect. Darwin was the originator and the philosopher. Huxley, who would unquestionably have been the foremost zoölogist and morphologist of his generation had there been no theory of natural selection, was able to add in support of Darwin's conclusions not only the weight of his knowledge and experience on the zoölogical side, but also an extraordinary gift of effectively popularizing science which proved of inestimable value in the fight for evolution. Hooker was, by common assent, the leading botanist of the world in his generation, and was able from his vast knowledge of the plant kingdom to contribute greatly to the foundation of the Darwinian theory on that side. Also, the weight of authority which accrued from his official position as Director at Kew was an asset of the utmost value to anyone launching a new biological theory.

As time passes, thoughtful persons will esteem the world of scholarship to be singularly fortunate in possessing such complete biographical details as it has about each member of this great triumvirate. Darwin's "Life and Letters," the "More Letters," and "Emma Darwin" together furnish a vivid and detailed picture of the life of the Darwin family for something over a century. Huxley's "Life and Letters," which appeared nearly twenty years ago, was a brilliant piece of biographical writing, which has had a remarkably stimulating influence on young biologists in this country. Now, at last, we have the series completed with these two volumes of Hookeriana. The literary and scientific unity of the whole series of evolution biographies is noteworthy and probably unique in the annals of literature. It arises primarily because of the fact that the definitive lives of two of the three, Darwin and Huxley, were written by their sons, and that one of these sons, Leonard Huxley, was entrusted with the preparation of the life of the third. With the appearance of these Hooker volumes, Leonard Huxley has firmly established his position as the authoritative historian of the Darwinian theory.

The life of Joseph Dalton Hooker proceeded in quiet, steady, and orderly progression to the highest goals a scientific man can have. Born in 1817 at Halesworth, Suffolk, he was taken at the early age of three to Glasgow, where his father, Sir William Hooker, had been appointed to the newly founded Chair of Botany. He grew up as a boy in the atmosphere of a university botanical garden and herbarium. His earliest interests were mosses and the reading of voyages and travels. In 1832, at the age of fifteen, he entered Glasgow University. In September, 1839, he set sail with Ross's expedition to the Antarctic, officially Assistant Surgeon to the Erebus, and unofficially Botanist of the expedition. The epic days of scientific exploration began with Cook's first voyage. The voyages of Darwin in the Beagle and Hooker in the Erebus belong to the same epoch. This voyage gave Hooker his first great scientific opportunity. He utilized it to the full, and when he returned to England four years later his reputation as a botanist of the first rank was firmly established.

In the meantime his father, Sir William, had been appointed Director of the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew, so that upon his return he settled there and took up the laborious task of writing the "Flora Antarctica," which was officially the report of his work on the expedition. Short trips to the continent to meet the botanists of Europe and examine the great herbaria were incidents of this period, as were also the disagreeable experiences as a candidate, successively, for the Chairs of Botany at Glasgow and at Edinburgh. The first settled post came in 1846, when he was appointed Botanist to the Geological Survey at the magnificent salary of £150.

The second great landmark in Hooker's life was the trip to India. He had been eager almost from the moment of returning from the Antarctic to embark upon another botanical exploration, by preference this time to the tropics. At last the opportunity came, and he left England in the autumn of 1847, full of enthusiasm and bearing the hall-mark of scientific standing implied by the recently acquired F.R.S. The next four years were devoted to a piece of botanical exploration which probably has no peer. The flora of the whole Himalayan region was virtually unknown. Hooker went over it with a thoroughness which has excited the admiration of every geographer, botanist, and engineer who has travelled in northern India. Such small matters as imprisonment by hostile natives, or the extraordinary physical hardships he was compelled to endure, could not swerve him from his purpose. The resulting collections and monographs constitute one of the great and enduring chapters in the history of botanical science.

Soon after his return from India matters developed in such a way as to make possible that which had long been desired by both father and son, the appointment of Joseph Hooker as Assistant Director at Kew. After Sir William's death ten years later, Hooker was elevated to the Directorship, and the remainder of his active life was passed in an environment which to a botanist is as nearly ideal as anything this side of Paradise could possibly be.

These are the outstanding features of the career of Sir Joseph Hooker. To tell of his part in the intellectual developments of the last half of the nineteenth century would be to rehearse once more the story of the dissemination of the doctrine of evolution. In its essential features this is now too well known to warrant even outlining. One highly useful purpose which the present biography serves, however, is to throw new sidelights on some of the well-known events. Among the most remarkable letters in the book is one to Darwin, written from Oxford immediately after the memorable session of the British Association, at which "Soapy Sam," the Bishop of Oxford, attacked Darwin, and Huxley delivered his famous retort. Hooker's version of what happened, and his part in turning the scales in Darwin's favor, makes highly interesting reading. Popular opinion usually gives to Huxley the entire credit for crushing the slippery divine. Clearly some revision of this view is necessary in the light of the racy account which Hooker gives of the incident in a letter to Darwin.

As the years passed many honors came to Hooker—merely to list them requires ten closely printed octavo pages. Perhaps the two greatest were the presidency of the Royal Society, which came in 1873, and meant the leadership of the English-speaking scientific world, and the Knight Grand Commandership in the Star of India, one of the most coveted of all British decorations. All the numerous honors and public recognition passed over Hooker without changing him in the slightest degree from the modest, unassuming, quiet, shy, and hard-working botanist he had always been. Though he held an important administrative position during the greater portion of his life, there was nothing about him of the traditional executive who "executes" while others do the work.

His views on many subjects far removed from botany were interesting and vigorous. Thus in a letter to W. E. Darwin in 1893 he says: "I am dreamer enough to look for a time when America will forbid a European war! What a splendid rôle this would be for a nation to undertake—to send us all to our tents and tell us that we may snarl at one another in the length and breadth of Europe as much as we please, but nothing more,

LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that if we go further she will intervene." Again the following in 1890 appears to have been truly prophetic: "Bismarck was not the only man of blood and iron in Germany; the whole of Prussia breathes arrogance, and this chirruppy young Emperor will soon be the tool of faction. He evidently has no conception of the difficulties and dangers of his position."

The family life at Kew was delightful. To the family, Hooker was the "lion": a rugged and fierce beast as to appearance, but of a temperament, one judges, closely similar to that of Mr. Bernard Shaw's gentle and sprightly leonine creation. His hobby was his collection of Wedgwood ware, particularly the portrait medallions, which finally became one of the best of private collections. In the general fields of literature and art he was not only interested but informed. In these days of narrower and narrower specialization, when everything which might by any chance be of general cultural value, as opposed to immediate practical utility, is being cast aside by our educational authorities as worse than worthless for anybody, but particularly for a scientific man, such a life as Hooker's seems very ancient history indeed. If one mildly ventures today to broach among his younger scientific colleagues the discussion of some such matter as the charm of the Little Masters, or the modernity of the views of Lucian on a variety of subjects, he will be met, at least nine times out of ten, with a blank stare inspired in about equal degrees by ignorance and contempt. One youth more kindly than the others may take the trouble to point out that a scientist, if he intends to be successful in these days, a real investigator in short, has no time to waste on such things as the classics. He must be always at his researches. One wonders. Just on a purely pragmatic basis, it would appear that Sir Joseph Hooker was a real investigator. He certainly turned out an enormous amount of solid work and made a good many first-class discoveries in that science. Yet he found time to collect "little china dogs," so to speak. And, curiously enough, it appears, if one reads the history of science, that about all the first-class discoveries which have ever been made have been the work of broadly cultured men, who knew a great deal besides their own particular specialty. It seems an odd coincidence. It occurs to one that it would be highly desirable if a great many people just at this time would read the "Life and Letters of Sir Joseph Hooker." It would certainly be an entertaining diversion, and could not possibly do any harm.

American Types

Twelve Men. By Theodore Dreiser. New York: Boni and Liveright.

THE work of Theodore Dreiser has been, from time to time, the subject of a controversy not lacking in heat. Both parties to this quarrel have fixed their attention upon his preoccupation with sex, and the reactions of both have been a trifle strained and morbid. Mr. Dreiser is, of course, not really more preoccupied with that single theme than is the conventional novelist. But there are precisely two ways of interpreting life through literature. Either you assume antecedently that all people are, even in their lapses, spiritually identified with the dominant social morality of their group and age, or you do not. Mr. Dreiser does not. Observation and experience have led him to conclude, as they led Samuel Butler to conclude, that a great many people have never so identified themselves with group morality, that their conformity is born of fear or the web of circumstances, and that thus there arises a very acute and significant conflict. To call these people of his "bad" or to stigmatize their behavior as "animal" is perfectly justified from the point of view of an idealistic ethics. It is also perfectly sterile. Life is terribly concrete and insistent, and in all questions of human conduct an idealistic nominalism seems to serve no end save to arouse agreeable if not always charitable emotions in the philosophic breast.

A fruitful attack upon Mr. Dreiser's substance can be made only by invalidating his facts. But this no one has sought to do. What has constantly impressed good judges who were neither among his friends nor his detractors is the man's massive knowledge of those phases of American life with which he has chosen to deal. His powers of observation and of vicarious experience are of the first order. By virtue of them he ranks among the major novelists. His personal philosophy may be negligible, but so was Balzac's. His concrete subject-matter is marvellously varied and abundant. And the concrete, if it be adequately represented, points symbolically, as Goethe said, to the totality and the meaning of things.

If it be adequately represented! Here one comes upon the source of Mr. Dreiser's weakness. His substance reaches us despite his form. His structural technique is sound enough. In his longer stories he produces an illusion which shows him sensitive to the rhythm of life; in "Twelve Men" he experiments not unhappily in a new mood of narrative. In the narrower sense, however, he cannot write. No man of equal power has ever written so poorly. Even Balzac's French is more attractive and finished than Mr. Dreiser's English. He has moments of homely strength. But these are very brief, and he quickly returns to his masses of blunt and lumbering verbiage. His insensitiveness is partly linguistic, partly cultural. He is capable of constantly using "betimes" as though it meant "at times," and of bracketing "Salammbo" and "Quo Vadis" as works equal in kind and quality. And yet, somehow, his substance does reach and impress and profoundly move us. So that one finally gains a vision of him as of a giant in chains. In chains, indeed, but a giant none the less.

His new volume, "Twelve Men," consists of interpretative character sketches of real people. These pieces are so built as to suggest the progression of a spiritual drama, which usually ends upon a tragic note. The men are all men whom Mr. Dreiser has known and lived with, who have engaged his affection or admiration, and whose fate has induced in him a characteristic brooding over the strangeness of mortality. And they are nearly all people in whom great energy and vividness of mind and character came to a but broken and futile end. Such was his brother Paul, such the late Harris Merton Lyons, the financier in "Vanity, Vanity," and the artist W. L. S. Such, too, among humbler folk, were the impressive shop-keeper in "The Village Feudists" and the social reformer in "A Mayor and His People."

It is notable that the interest of sex is entirely absent from this volume. But, indeed, every attentive reader of Mr. Dreiser's work must have known that love is to him but the great anodyne that soothes, at moments, the ache of life and hides its futility. It is no less remarkable that the only ones among these narratives that sound a note of peace and reconciliation are those that treat of simple men who deliberately make their lives a round of

> "little, nameless, unremembered acts
> Of kindness and of love."

But these, too, fill Mr. Dreiser with a sense of keen pathos, a pathos not always rigidly enough guarded from the confines of sentimentality. Even so, it is but just to say that the Virgilian *nos mortalia tangunt* accurately renders the mood and burden of these portraits.

They have another value. Most of these men belong to vanishing types. Or, at least, the same types assume a very different guise today. And Mr. Dreiser has projected them, at times with an ease and fluidity unusual to him, at others through the torment of his amorphous manner, but always with a final effect that is massive and vivid at once. Thus they give one a very deep sense of American life—its feverish energy, its crude force alternating with sentimentality, its kindliness and its hostility to distinction and veracity. If it is the aim of imaginative narrative to clarify the soul by enlarging our experience of human life and character, Mr. Dreiser has once more vindicated his imperfect art and emphasized his station among our novelists.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Way Out

Proposed Roads to Freedom. By Bertrand Russell. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

BERTRAND RUSSELL is probably the greatest living mathematical philosopher; but it would be difficult to find internal evidence of that fact in "Proposed Roads to Freedom," or indeed in any of the books which he has written on subjects arising out of the war. These books are for the plain man, and they are written in an idiom which the plain man can understand. Yet they convey no suggestion of the condescending pundit, or of the conscientious pedagogue purveying pap to the untutored mind. That, however, does not mean that these books are not authentic and characteristic products of Mr. Russell's mind. You cannot gather much from them about his adventures in search of the infinite; but you can infer a good deal concerning him. Walter Bagehot says somewhere that the Duke of Wellington could not write a dispatch even about horseshoe nails without leaving upon it the impress of a great mind; and it is impossible for Bertrand Russell to write anything without revealing a mind of singular spaciousness and power.

But even more does he show a mind of essential humility and integrity. He pursues truth with unshod feet. One sees it in the scrupulous care with which he does justice to views from which he dissents, in his unwillingness to lay a heavier burden upon any evidence or argument than it can reasonably carry, in his consistent dread even of the appearance of dogmatism—and in other things as well. His mind is governed at once by a puritan conscience and by the heart of a child. There is a saying that the true scholar goes to his desk as to an altar: and one applies it with no sense of incongruity to Mr. Russell. One of the greatest gains of the war is that it has constrained Bertrand Russell to dedicate himself to the task of helping this generation to find a way out of the desperate tangle in which it is caught.

A word should also be said about Mr. Russell's manner of writing. So much that is written on reconstruction is wrapped up in technical obscurities that it is inaccessible to the man in the street; and yet it is the man in the street who above all others should be enticed to read nowadays. Why do the intellectuals appear to write only for the intellectuals? Surely, their business is to address themselves to common folk. And this Mr. Russell does with signal success. Yet he does it without any appearance of going out of his way to do so. Much of the charm of his books lies in their unaffected and unstrained simplicity of diction.

The first part of "Proposed Roads to Freedom" contains a survey, partly historical, partly critical, of the three great modern economic doctrines, Anarchism, Socialism, and Syndicalism. The brevity of this survey necessarily makes it slight; and it is in some respects open to criticism. It is questionable, for instance, whether full justice is done to Proudhon. Mr. Russell is, however, examining the three theories from the point of view of their bearing upon freedom. He is not primarily concerned with their economic validity; and the broad conclusion which he reaches is that under neither an anarchist nor a socialist nor a syndicalist régime is there an adequate guarantee of freedom. He sees more hope in Guild Socialism, which, as he says, is a characteristic British compromise between Socialism and Syndicalism. While Socialism on the one hand contains the danger of a "leviathan" State, and Syndicalism on the other destroys the State altogether, Guild Socialism preserves the State but so distributes its sovereignty as to rob it of its modern unitary and absolutist character. Mr. Russell recognizes the infinite waywardness of human nature too clearly to suppose that the National Guild system will solve all the problems; but he rightly affirms that it holds more promise for freedom and social growth than any of its alternatives.

The supreme value of this book lies in its clear perception that the real test of all schemes of social change is their effect upon freedom. Lord Acton held that, politically, freedom was not to be conceived as a means, but that it was, on the contrary, the chief political end. The business of government is to make and to keep men free. We are nowadays too apt to suppose that order is the fragile plant that needs our tending, and that freedom can be left to look after itself. This is pure fallacy. It is the easiest thing in the world to establish order—for a time, even for a long time. But it is a difficult and arduous task to care for freedom; and it is only preserved by eternal vigilance. On the economic side, also, we are moved chiefly by the spectacle of poverty and human misery, and our driving force—both in thought and action—is humanitarian. But it is infinitely more important to make men free than to make them happy. And as Mr. Cole says (in a passage aptly quoted by Mr. Russell), what the worker of today is fighting against is not poverty so much as slavery. The inwardness of labor unrest is an imperious craving for a larger and a more spacious life.

Mr. Russell sees, as most competent observers do, that the root of modern servitude lies in the economic insecurity of the workers. As things are, a man's livelihood depends upon the will of another, and the price of independence is unemployment and its ugly sequel, hunger. So long as this state of things prevails, it is idle to imagine that the worker will recognize his right to vote as a sufficient endowment of freedom; and, indeed, wherever the temper of proletarian insurgency has become articulate, it is to this point that it directs itself. Not more money or more leisure, but more freedom and independence. But the achievement of this freedom requires the abolition of the capitalist monopoly of the means of production and distribution, at least as far as the essentials of life are concerned; and, in addition, a definite separation of subsistence from work. Mr. Russell shows that with the improved methods of production and distribution to which we have every right to look forward, it should be possible even with a very short working day to provide a sufficiency of food and clothing for every member of the community. In this task of necessary production, every individual should share; but whether he shares in it or not, he should have guaranteed for him a minimum subsistence, a "vagabond's living." What work he chooses to do above his share of necessary labor, let him be paid for—an expedient which may prove an antidote to malingering. The reply will of course be made that a system of free food will put a premium upon idleness; and no doubt it will be a refuge for the incorrigibly slack. But it is questionable whether it would actually increase the number of parasites, rich and poor, who, as things are, are boarded and lodged upon the industry of the community.

The ideal arrangement would, of course, be a rule of "one man, two trades"—or "to every man a trade and his vocation." Let every man do his share of the necessary toil of the community; and when this is done, let him turn to the work that calls him and in which he may find delight. No doubt under Mr. Russell's scheme, it would in time come to this, though the whole ideal and method of education would have to be materially changed in order to bring it about. But more than a strictly wrought out plan, Mr. Russell is anxious to secure that freedom which will enable men to pursue the finer ends of life and to realize themselves in a noble fellowship, worthy thought, and a great creative art. He recognizes that not all men are naturally endowed for high achievement in these regions; but he rightly holds that every man has a right to the chance of becoming the whole full-sized man that it is in him to be. And since you cannot legislate for the incalculable variousness of human nature, your only way of giving a man this chance is to leave him as free as possible. Feed him and educate him, then let him go his way. You may trust the essential goodness of healthy human nature not to be unmindful of its obligations; and if you have untamed anarchic spirits about who in the exercise of their freedom injure their fellows—well, you still have your police.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Russell wants to have economic freedom secured, since without it there can be no real freedom—freedom of the mind; and it is for this freedom of the mind that he mostly fears under a socialist régime. He foresees a censorship upon thought and art which would be deadly to both. This is a real danger; and it is a question whether the State should not be required to renounce control over everything except the economic function, the public health, the elementary education, and the policing of the community. Hitherto the modern State has only reluctantly interfered with *laissez-faire* in commerce; while it has been again and again all too ready to lay violent hands on it when some adventurous mind has sought out new pathways in religion or thought or art. The proper sphere of *laissez-faire* is the world of the mind; and the business of government is so to organize the rest of life that the mind shall go free. Some day we may reach a state of society in which the dissenter is not only tolerated but even encouraged; that, indeed, will be a great day, a veritable "day of the Lord." But meantime—Bertrand Russell is only lately out of jail and Eugene Debs is still there.

Tales Well-Made

Tales of Secret Egypt. By Sax Rohmer. New York: Robert M. McBride and Company.

Civilization. By Ellen N. La Motte. New York: George H. Doran Company.

Love Stories. By Mary Roberts Rinehart. New York: George H. Doran Company.

Humoresque: A Laugh on Life with a Tear Behind It. By Fannie Hurst. New York: Harper and Brothers.

AMONG the books of the moment for which book-dealers predict popularity and perhaps a throne among the "best-sellers" is at least one of these collections of short stories. According to one's mood and temper, "Tales of Secret Egypt" may be coldly described as expert nonsense or warmly enjoyed as the same. It frankly takes the "mysterious East" of the tourist and makes it magazinable. The scene is Cairo and adjacent parts. The author "exploits" it as in the "Fu-Manchu" yarns he has exploited a yellower Orient. The chief persons are the supposed narrator, a youngish Englishman named Kernaby. He is nominally in Egypt as agent of an English firm which deals in real and bogus antiquities and curios of the East. His true business seems to be to get into as many pickles as possible, and to be, as it were, yanked out of them by one Abû Tabâh, an *imám* of imperturbable aspect and supernal wisdom who is really in the employ of the British authorities as a sort of trouble-fender. Kernaby blunders or thrusts into all kinds of forbidden enterprises; but with the aid of Allah, Abû Tabâh, and Sax Rohmer, he succeeds in emerging unscathed. There is a touch of novelty in making the hero of these adventures an Englishman of frankly sordid and unscrupulous methods, instead of the customary Paladin of romantic fiction. The words *yashmak, dîwan, mushrabîyeh,* and *tarbûsh* do their slightly jaded best in the way of Oriental glamour, supplemented here and there by a phrase which, for all we know, may well be Arabic as alleged.

The Oriental tales in "Civilization" are of very different source and quality. They are not popular stuff. Several of them were published in the *Century Magazine;* none could conceivably have been harbored by the *Saturday Evening Post.* They have, to be sure, plenty of vigor and "punch"; but they do not take a cheerful view of the white man in the act of bearing his burden in Eastern lands. The title-story has the acrid cynicism of a Maupassant *conte.* Nothing could be less traditionally "feminine" than the group as a whole, except for their mood of passionate sympathy for races which the white man looks upon as naturally and hopelessly inferior. There is the minor British official in Shanghai, the decent young chap who, avoiding the promiscuous vices of the China Coast, takes a Chinese mistress to himself, and after fifteen years, at last enabled to go Home, leaves his woman and his half-breed son ("provided for," of course) with a comfortable feeling of virtue. "So many men go to pieces out in the East, but he, somehow, had managed to keep himself clear and clean." The rider to this episode concerns the fate of the predestined outcast who is his son. There is the drunken beach-comber who, under protection of his theoretically white skin, may lord it in safety over the most respectable of yellow men. There is the young lieutenant of a far outpost who in the name of civilization and with a sort of nonchalance teaches a terrible "lesson" to a handful of rebellious savages. He has them lined up and shot by members of their own race. The lieutenant is decorated; the native troops who have been forced to shoot their fellows refuse to "enlist" in the European war a little later—and become a chain-gang. And so on. The substance is grim, the style brusque and ironic. They might be (speaking vaguely) the work of a minor Maupassant who cared, or of a minor Kipling who had for the once put himself in the "native's" shoes.

The other tales in our group are primarily popular stuff. Mrs. Rinehart's "Love Stories" are deliberately sentimental: since the armistice was signed there is, we hear, a great demand from the magazine editors for sweet stories. Seven of these eight are hospital stories. They are skilfully compounded according to the current recipe. If smile and tear (as she seems to claim in her present sub-title) are symbolic of Fannie Hurst's fiction, one may say that wink and sigh would stand for Mrs. Rinehart's. She loves to be a little brutal, a little vulgar (so human!) on the surface; with a smooth river of romantic syrup, a clear and honest syrup, flowing steadily beneath. Most people are absurd, but all people are "dear"; and the love of boy and girl or man and woman (less of the latter in Mrs. Rinehart's picture), say what you will, best brings out for our inspection and admiration both that absurdity and that dearness. These hospital stories, while they affect to blink none of the unpleasant realities of hospital routine, throw all the emphasis elsewhere. One might gather, taking them literally, that it is the chief occupation of Internes and Junior Medicals to make love to the nearest pretty nurse or probationer; that their only rivals at that sport are princes (that is to say, millionaires) disguised as patients; and that the maternity ward for casual mothers is a natural lurking-place of romance. Accepting all these premises for the nonce, the reader who likes the usual sort of thing rather well done may find an hour of emotional relaxation in these pages. This may be said of most of the tales in "Humoresque." Miss Fannie Hurst now pushes Miss Edna Ferber hard for the coveted place of leading "feminine 'O. Henry'" among the thousands who are practising the still lucrative trick of that master's manner. Both of these writers have uncommon story-telling powers. We wish they might have been free to develop their own matter and style. Fate and the magazine-public have forbidden, and we must judge them as performers in the recognized manner—like public dancers who clog or dip according to contract. Miss Hurst is more daring than Miss Ferber: she carries the philosophical or descriptive introduction to a sublime pitch. She flings herself at language and tosses it about as if it were only her business what she does with it. She has a real instinct for it as a fluid, flexible, living thing. Unhappily, she has also an impulse to distort it for momentary effect. In the present volume, as in its predecessors by the same author, altogether the best stories are those, such as "A Petal in the Current" and "The Wrong Pew," which are studies of her own race in America, the prosperous Jew one generation from European peasanthood, cool-headed, warm-hearted in the narrower and more possessive way, the successful competitor in business of the native American whose methods are more indolent and well-mannered and, in his own theory at least, more scrupulous.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

IS the religious quickening caused by the world war responsible for the American re-issue of Huysmans's "En Route" (Dutton)? First published in England in 1896, one year after the appearance of the French original, this story of a soul's conversion and purification is in no sense a novel; it is a confession, exhaustive and exhausting in its prolix introspective honesty—a confession which only recalls the tortured self-questionings of St. Augustine. It progresses as slowly and heavily as they, with something of the rambling solidity of the monastery walls which frame so many chapters; but it has a psychological interest in the rugged vividness of its self-dissection, as in the vividness and realistic strength of its time-worn background of stone. One seems to be lifted back into the Middle Ages, to realize something of their naïve belief, in this narrative filled with sombrely magnificent pictures, wherein an author's religious experience develops into little essays or dialogues on the "Dies Iræ," the "De Profundis," the symbolism of the Liturgy, the lives and miracles of the saints, the monastic rule, and the various orders and monasteries. It is, indeed, a disguised confession: the translator's preface, an attempt to prove the objectivity of the story, is belied by the subsequent facts of Huysmans's life. His own conversion was attended if not conditioned by similar retreats to similar asylums; he, too, was led to mysticism æsthetically, through his senses; indeed, his whole art, after its first moment of objective naturalism, only shows us the personal reactions of its author's own pessimism, as the sick man turned here or there in his search for an anodyne for his exasperated neurasthenia. From his nerves, indeed, his art, like his dyspepsia, sprang: his diction, rough, vibrant, surly, "strangles the image in a muscular fist," or slashes deep into the *corpus vile* of life, with no professional apologies to the reader. Argot, neologisms—all words are good, if they will but give him the last fleeting impression, sharpen the very razor-edge of the sensation. The translation by Mr. Kegan Paul is faithful to this blunt honesty, as it is to the religious motive of the original.

"ENGLISH Poets of the Eighteenth Century," compiled by Professor Ernest Bernbaum, is one in a projected series of four or five volumes, comprising the English poets from Elizabethan to Victorian times, in the excellent "Modern Student's Library" (Scribners). The editor has managed to effect an altogether unusual harmony between his Introduction and his selection from the poets, the Introduction furnishing a succinctly informative commentary upon the text and the poems illustrating admirably the course of development outlined in the Introduction. The four quarters of the eighteenth century, according to Mr. Bernbaum, are characterized respectively by a quietistic reaction from the turbulence of the Stuart period; by the beginnings of the sentimental revolt from the orthodoxy and classical tastes of the first years of the century; by a marked progress in sentimentalism between 1751 and 1775, when Gray stood out as the champion of the old classicism in style and restraint, though a scholar of broader interests than was possible before sentimentalism become influential; and by "The Triumph of Sentimentalism" during the last quarter of the century. This development, though not so cut-and-dried as Mr. Bernbaum seems to infer, is marked fairly accurately by the chronological boundaries here given. With greater space at his command, the editor could of course have made his account more convincing, for the strides that sentimentalism made in the drama and the novel, especially during the middle period, were of much more significance than what was accomplished in poetry. Those who are acquainted with Mr. Bernbaum's earlier writings on the subject will not be surprised at his complete identification of sentimentalism with romanticism. It is to be regretted, however, that he gives no indication of opposing points of view that allow to the view of life developed from the philosophy of Shaftesbury only the credit of being one of the influences that entered into the movement of mind known as romanticism. The dictum that "Blake was the ultimate sentimentalist of the century" is particularly open to debate. In the main, however, the Introduction is a notably well-reasoned piece of work. The poems selected for inclusion are not furnished with notes, which in certain cases is unfortunate; but this want is made up in part by a full glossary. The unavoidable fault of all anthologies, that they cannot suit the tastes of everybody, is of course present here, especially in the selections from Watts, Cowper, and Blake. Very commendable is the inclusion of various poems which, though their chance of attracting readers today for their own merits is small, are of great historical value as illustrations of the poetic taste and progress of poetry in the eighteenth century.

UNDER the title, "Ivan Speaks" (Houghton Mifflin), Mr. Thomas Whittemore has translated a collection of "Sayings overheard by a Russian nurse, working among Russian soldiers at the front in 1915, 1916, and 1917." According to the preface, "these detached utterances of wounded soldiers, many of whom could neither read nor write, lying in their cots, were spoken without premeditation or thought of the nurse's presence." While one of the smallest of war-books, it is also one of the most revealing. The brief quotations of which it is made up show the lucidity with which Russian peasants and workmen could envisage the war, and testify to a depth of comprehension which seems to have been lacking in the more sophisticated peasants and workmen of other countries. The pages of Mr. Whittemore's little book corroborate, in a sense, what Maxim Gorky and others have written about the Russian character. Here is no new interpretation but actual words spoken by the Russian himself, through which his nature stands revealed and by which the various portrayals of him may be judged. Whatever may seem fabulous in the wisdom of Gorky's workmen and the self-understanding of Dostoevsky's peasants becomes credible in the light of these utterances of common soldiers. There is a lyric and seer-like quality about them which suggests that perhaps the Russian workman and peasant—to a far greater degree than our own farm and factory worker—dares to look deep into his own soul, and dares to speak his mind to his fellows. Certainly, one would scarcely expect to hear a wounded American "doughboy" say: "I feel queer here sometimes at night before I fall asleep, if I am tired. I seem to be not myself, and I try to think of some word, some gentle tender word, such as 'blossom' or 'dawn,' or something like that, something sweet and pleasant. Then I will sit on my cot, and keep repeating that word to myself, ten times or more. And then it seems as if a kind hand caresses me, and so I go to sleep." Poignantly articulate of human suffering and the yearnings of the spirit, the pages of this little book synthesize the mingled wisdom, poetry, brutality, and gentleness of the Russian soul.

IN studying the problem of "The Little Town" (Macmillan), Mr. Harlan Paul Douglass has made a pertinent and scientific contribution to the growing literature of civics. The author's aim was to treat the little town with special respect to its rural relationships, but he has worked over his field so extensively that there is scarcely an aspect of the country town's existence that he does not consider and appraise. Mr. Douglass starts with a sound perception which the student of the great metropolis is often blind enough to overlook: namely, that the town is but a focus for the social activities of the surrounding region. With its school, its library, its townhall, possibly its theatre, the little town functions as the capital, the higher cerebral centre, of its countryside. Unfortunately, the greater part of the continent west of the coastal states has been subdivided by the land surveyor into districts which have no political reason for existence. The problem of renovating the social life of a region is therefore dependent to no little extent upon our ability to recognize and reconstitute a more natural social unit

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that shall observe the "actual working relationships and human groupings" of the rural-urban community. This attempt to supplant a formal political structure by a functional one, and to establish a sound basis for local government and other local social institutions, is the quest of the younger generation of political scientists today. Professor Galpin at Wisconsin, Mr. H. J. Laski at Harvard, and Miss M. P. Follett in her recent book on "The New State" have attacked the problem on the theoretical side; while the Social Unit at Cincinnati and Mr. John Collier's community centre in New York are working out for their intensely urban communities the implications of the new movement in concrete detail. "Democracy cannot be locally expressed to good advantage," Mr. Douglass observes, "until our minor civil units are freed from the surveyor's chain." The tracing out of that idea alone is enough to elevate "The Little Town" out of the ranks of superficial "uplift" books with which the literature of civics has been debauched.

ALL the brilliancy and all the cynical realism of Maupassant find expression in "Yvette and Ten Other Stories" (Knopf), as translated by Mrs. John Galsworthy. The title-story introduces us to a corner of the demi-monde at Paris—the demi-monde of wealth and aristocratic pretension, with its titled blackguards and *grandes cocottes*, its gilded lupanars and facile loves. It is the story of a dung-hill flower, unconscious of its origins and its ultimate destiny—a repellent deterministic novelette, rendered more repellent by the author's absolute detachment from all moral interest in the situation, a cynical fatalism worthy of the *blasé* actors in the tragi-comedy. Then come four sketches of the Franco-Prussian War, tales of the invasion, equally brutal but revealing plainly enough the author's real sympathy in the wanton cruelty or stupidity of his Prussians. Three stories of peasant life in his native Normandy—including the inimitable "Piece of String"—a satirical sketch of middle-class stinginess, and two old maids' tragedies, alone sympathetic, complete the volume. The selection leaves unrepresented Maupassant's broad animal humor and the nightmare vein of many later stories—"Sur l'eau" and "Le Horla," in particular—which, by their presage of his ultimate nervous breakdown, show the price he paid for following the conclusions of his philosophy. To present Maupassant without at least one of these latter is to justify that philosophy. Mrs. Galsworthy's translation is lively, free from Gallicism, and almost free from mistakes; and Mr. Joseph Conrad contributes an interesting preface on the art of the great Frenchman.

JOHN REED'S
"TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD"
is, even according to a hostile press, "the most important and informative book yet published on the Russian Revolution." . . . And it is gradually but actually becoming a "best-seller"—Now in its FOURTH PRINTING.
Buy it today—all bookstores.
Profusely Illustrated, 400 pages, $2.00
Postage 15c. extra.
Boni & Liveright, 109 W. 40th St., N. Y., Publishers

Drama

"John Ferguson"

REAL tragedy is the most cheering of play forms. Aristotle's requisite, "purging of the feelings through pity and fear" is only the negative side of the question. There is a positive side too. Tragedy revives one's faith in the worth of living. It is a faith that Broadway does its best to kill. Some day even the tired business man will make this simple discovery about the drama. After a depressing diet of average plays, the caricatures of our farce, the false motivation of our melodrama, the meretricious emotion of our comedy, he will some day stumble in on such a play as St. John Ervine's "John Ferguson," and rediscover the glorious fact that human nature and human problems are sufficiently serious and dignified affairs to justify serious and dignified treatment.

It is difficult to summarize a play like "John Ferguson" in a few words for it is not a play of a single theme or a single character, and to a public accustomed to carefully thinned dramatic material, it has a bewildering richness of implication. The scene is laid among the Protestant peasantry of North Ireland, and the intensely vivid story is developed through such profound characterization that it produces a heightened impression of reality, an inspiring sense of "life like a dome of many-colored glass, staining the white radiance of eternity." Curiously enough, while the play is preoccupied with revealed religion, while the struggle of old John Ferguson is the struggle of Job, the gesture of the play is Greek. It has the irony of Sophocles. The revelations of religion on which John Ferguson has built his life cannot illuminate the darkness in which he walks. He may take refuge in the twilight of his faith, he may call the destruction that comes upon him and his family, God's will, and may endure patiently, waiting the "joy that cometh in the morning." But his children—and the audience—know better. "God's late, Da!" cries his daughter in the last act and the bitterness of it rings true. Man is still the victim of blind chance, his salvation is not God but himself—this is the simple humanistic belief to which Hannah and Andrew are driven beneath the stinging blows of life. They take upon themselves their own task of revenge, and their own problem of atonement. They ask no favors from a merciful God. Stoics and realists, they go out to meet life on its own hard terms, leaving their father to the consolation of his faith. The play has that mixture of chance and character motivation which makes the Greek drama at once so true and so ironic. It has at the same time an extraordinarily intimate realism.

Bethlehem Bach Festival
June 6th, 4 p. m. and 8 p. m.
Eight Cantatas
June 7th, 2 p. m. and 4.30 p. m.
Mass in B Minor
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
Bethlehem, Pa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the most interesting themes in the play is the cowardice of Hannah's lover, Jimmy Caesar, a difficult part, by the way, played with rare skill and sincerity by Dudley Digges. It is hard to recall any more subtle and profound analysis than this of a weakling, with a weakling's selfish and petty passions, conscious and ashamed of his cowardice, and at the same time deriving a sentimental enjoyment from the contemplation of it. Jimmy Caesar lusts and hates, threatens and cringes. Later he tastes and savors reality, wallowing in his own abjectness. The half-wit, Clutie John, brings another interesting, though less novel, motif into the play. The tragic value of the half-wit, probably established for all time in "Lear," is used by St. John Ervine with great effectiveness. There is much method in Clutie John's madness; the loss of his "wits" has immensely sharpened his intuitions, and the scene in which by suggestion he convinces Andrew that the burden of revenge will be left to him by the coward Jimmy has rare dramatic quality. Henry Herbert's playing of the rôle also deserves enthusiastic comment.

With the production of "John Ferguson," the Theatre Guild emerges from its experimental stage, free from the usual derogatory connotations of the "little theatre." The present offering is one of the most satisfying and distinguished productions of the season. The play is well staged, sincerely produced, adequately—in parts brilliantly—acted. The Theatre Guild shows promise of developing into the competent and intelligent repertoire theatre long wanted in New York. T. H.

Finance

Financing Other Nations

THE Paris announcement of the formation of a new consortium for making loans to China recalls the effort made several years ago by the Six-Power syndicate to make similar investments in China. That project, so far as American banking representation was concerned, had to be abandoned, owing to the refusal of the State Department, then under the direction of Mr. Bryan, to give the bankers the necessary assurance of support in their undertaking.

War has brought many changes, and one of the most significant has been the development of a world-wide coöperation between great banking interests. The Federal authorities are solidly back of the present project to invest American capital in China. There are more than thirty-five of our banks in this undertaking, and the probability is that the enterprise this time will be successful. Important banking interests of Great Britain, France, and Japan are also identified with the movement. The requirements call for the lending of immense sums to China, with such guarantees of protection and security as that country can give.

The peace compact has brought together many previously competing factions, and it can be said that there never was a time when the great banking interests of the United States were more genuinely in harmony than they are today. The Government's attitude is apparently that in cases where the terms of the loans are just and the conditions reasonable, such advances by American banking interests will be sanctioned, providing they are desired by the Chinese Government. If no further hitch should be encountered, the probability is that the present movement will become of great importance. An immense amount of new financing remains to be done. Much of it has been held up during the war period, and is still held up during the reconstruction period, until some definite policy can be determined upon for controlling affairs. The indications are that the present syndicate will be further enlarged by the addition of Belgian interests and banks of other countries, if necessary. The American banks are well able to make such loans, if their managers desire to do so. The field is inviting, for the reason that there is an immense volume of this financing to attend to before anything like a proper development of China's resources will have been attained.

After this project has been taken care of, it is probable that the bankers will give their attention to the needs of other countries. Various banking representatives are already investigating conditions abroad in the effort to provide for the safeguarding of American capital in those countries which are bidding eagerly for our investment support. There never was a time when the world demand for American capital was broader or more urgent than it is today. The probability is that very large investments of American capital will be made in foreign countries during the next few years; indeed they must be made if this country is to make the most of its extraordinary foreign trade opportunity. The situation is full of investment possibilities which were never before available for our banking interests. Some important announcements may be made later on, when the banking experts return from their inquiry in foreign fields. WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Brooks, Charles C. Chimney-Pot Papers. Yale Press. $2.
Courtney, W. L. Old Saws and Modern Instances. Dutton.
Dunsany, Lord. Nowadays. Boston: Four Seas Company.
Murray, Gilbert. Aristophanes and the War Party. London: Allen & Unwin.
Pailleron, Marie-Louise. La Vie Littéraire. Paris: Calmann-Levy.
Shanks, Lewis P. Anatole France. Chicago: Open Court Company. $1.50.

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

GONE WEST

By a SOLDIER-DOCTOR

Edited by H. M. G. and M. H. H.
Introduction by Frederick W. Kendall
of the Buffalo Express.

"These letters, or messages, from a soldier doctor who has been serving throughout the war on the spirit side, make the plea for a more rational acceptance of the thing we call death. There is revealed in them a suggestion of a philosophy which cannot but help those many thousands who are so heavy of heart because of what they deem the losses which the Great War has brought to them."—*Frederick W. Kendall.* **$1.00 at bookshops**

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 West Forty-second St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Williams, Blanche C. How to Study "The Best Short Stories." Small, Maynard. $1.50.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Chesterton, Cecil. A History of the United States. Doran. $2.50.
Cole, Arthur C. Illinois During the Era of the Civil War. Springfield: Illinois Centennial Commission.
Kite, Elizabeth S. Beaumarchais, and the War of American Independence. Boston: Badger. $5.
Lecomte, George. Georges Clemenceau. Appleton. $1.50.
McIlwaine, H. R., editor. Legislative Journal of the Council of Colonial Virginia. Richmond: Virginia State Library.

POETRY AND DRAMA

Harris, Rendel. The Return of the "Mayflower." Longmans, Green. $1.
How, Louis. Nursery Rhymes of New York City. Knopf. $1.
Leland, Robert DeC. Syncopation. Boston: Poetry-Drama Company. $2.
Preston, Keith. Types of Pan. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25.
Waley, Arthur, translator. A Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems. Knopf. $2.

FICTION

Buckrose, J. E. The Tale of Mr. Tubbs. Doran. $1.50.
Canby, Henry S. Our House. Macmillan. $1.50.
Grenfell, Wilfred T. Labrador Days. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50.
Ibanez, Blasco. Luna Benamor. Boston: Luce & Co. $1.25.
Jones, Doris E. The Year Between. Philadelphia: Jacobs & Company.
MacNamara, Brinsley. The Valley of the Squinting Windows. Brentano's. $1.50.
Marshall, Archibald. The Clintons, and Others. Dodd, Mead. $1.75.
Oppenheim, E. Phillips. The Wicked Marquis. Little, Brown.
Reed, Margery V. Futurist Stories. New York: Kennerley.
Simpson, John T. Hidden Treasure. Lippincott. $1.50.
Stock, Etta F. The Redemption of Charley Phillips. Boston: Four Seas Company. $1.25.
Stock, Etta F. To Every Man His Work. Boston: Four Seas Company. $1.25.
Sudermann, Hermann. The Silent Mill. Brentano's. $1.25.
Terhune, Albert P. Lad: A Dog. Dutton. $1.75.
Wemyss, Mary C. E. Oranges and Lemons. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50.

ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY

Grice, Ettalene M. Chronology of the Larsa Dynasty. Yale Press.
Keiser, Clarence E. Patesis of the Ur Dynasty. Yale Press.
Sinclair, W. A. Painting. Boston: Four Seas.

COMMERCE AND BUSINESS

Bigwood, George. Cotton. Holt. $1.60.
Maxwell, William. The Training of a Salesman. Lippincott. $1.50.
Moore, James T. M. American Business in World Markets. Doran. $2.
Ormerod, Frank. Wool. Holt. $1.60.

THE SIX HOUR DAY and OTHER INDUSTRIAL QUESTIONS

By Lord Leverhulme

Lord Leverhulme has made actual experiments with the six-hour day, profit-sharing, schemes, etc., in his own great industrial enterprises, and advocates them, not as a visionary, but as the head of a great business concern with an eye turned toward the future of production, and the mental, moral, and physical welfare of the workers. ($3.50 net.)

A German view of the League—

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

By Mathias Erzberger

Herr Erzberger takes up such questions as Germany and the World's Peace, Compulsory Arbitration, Disarmament, Freedom of International Trade, Colonial Problems, Composition and Executive Means of the League, and a German View of what the Constitution should be. ($2.25 net.)

CRIME AND CRIMINALS

By Charles Mercier, M.D.

"The most sensible book that has yet been written on this particular subject."—*London Times.* ($2.50 net.)

A juvenile for these times—

REBELS AND REFORMERS

By A. and D. Ponsonby

This is the first book to bring within the reach of younger readers the lives of such notable figures as Savonarola, Bruno, Voltaire, Mazzini, William Lloyd Garrison, and Thoreau—men who dared think and act for themselves. (Illustrated, $1.60 net.)

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44th St. New York

UNIVERSITY of MANITOBA

Winnipeg, Canada

The Board of Governors invite applications for the following appointments:

Assistant-Professor of Chemistry, with special qualifications in Physical Chemistry. Initial salary for this grade of appointment, $2100. (Applications in this instance from candidates who stipulate a minimum salary up to $2500 will be considered.)

Assistant-Professor of Political Economy, to contribute generally to the work of the department but preferably with special qualifications in Economic History and Commerical Geography. Initial salary $2100.

Lecturer in Botany, to assist generally in the work of the department and carry on research. Initial salary, $1600.

Lecturer in Zoology, to assist generally in the work of the department and carry on research. Initial salary, $1600.

Assistant in Physiology, with special qualifications in Experimental Physiology, salary $1200.

Ten copies, typewritten or printed, of letter of application and testimonials should be in the hands of the undersigned, in the case of the Assistant-Professorship in Chemistry by May 31st; in the case of the Lectureship in Zoology, the Assistantship in Physiology and the Assistant Professorship in Political Economy, by July 7th, and in the case of the Lectureship in Botany by July 15th.

The successful candidates will be expected to enter upon their new duties about September 1st, 1919.

The Secretary, Board of Governors,
University of Manitoba,
Winnipeg, CANADA.

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him, and The Nation.

ARISTODEMOCRACY

From the Great War Back to Moses, Christ and Plato

By SIR CHARLES WALSTON

NEW AND CHEAPER EDITION WITH A SECOND AMERICAN PREFACE

8vo. $1.50 *net.* *Postage extra.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Patriotism, National and International

AN ESSAY. $1.00 *net.*

WHAT GERMANY IS FIGHTING FOR

60 *cents net.*

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
FOURTH AVE. AND 30TH St., NEW YORK

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him, and The Nation.

***The* PHILOSOPHY *of* B*RTR*ND R*SS*LL**

With an Appendix of Leading Passages From Certain Other Works

Edited by PHILIP E. B. JOURDAIN

Pages 96 *With a picture wrapper* *Price $1.00*

An amazing volume of delicate irony which exposes much solemn humbug in philosophy.

OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

122 South Michigan Ave. CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

A GENTLE CYNIC Being the Book of Ecclesiastes

By MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., Ph.D., LL.D. Author of "The War and the Bagdad Railway," etc. Small 4to. $2.00 net

A delightfully human book on the Omar Khayyam of the Bible with an exact translation of the original text. How it came to be written and who wrote it (and it was not Solomon), why additions were made to the original text and the whole interesting story is here given.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY - Philadelphia

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Sections

The Nation

Section. II

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1919 No. 2812

Out of His Own Mouth

President Wilson In Opposition to the Peace Treaty

Extracts From His Public Addresses During the War

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

Other Protests Against the Treaty

"I have not uttered in my public capacity my own private thoughts. I have uttered what I have known to be the thoughts of the great people whom I represent. I have uttered the things that have been stored up in their hearts and purpose from the time of our birth as a nation."

President Wilson, Paris, May 10, 1919

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The President on the Peace

I. The Ideals of the War

Peace Without Victory

The present war must first be ended; but we owe it to candor and to a just regard for the opinion of mankind to say that, so far as our participation in guarantees of future peace is considered, it makes a great deal of difference in what way and upon what terms it is ended. The treaties and agreements which bring it to an end must embody terms which will create a peace that is worth guaranteeing and preserving, a peace that will win the approval of mankind, not merely a peace that will serve the several interests and immediate aims of the nations engaged.

The question upon which the whole future peace and policy of the world depends is this: *Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace, or only for a new balance of power?* If it be only a struggle for a new balance of power, who will guarantee, who can guarantee, the stable equilibrium of the new arrangement? Only a tranquil Europe can be a stable Europe. There must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace.

. . . The statesmen of both of the groups of nations now arrayed against one another have said, in terms that could not be misinterpreted, that it was no part of the purpose they had in mind to crush their antagonists. But the implications of these assurances may not be equally clear to all—may not be the same on both sides of the water. I think it will be serviceable if I attempt to set forth what we understand them to be.

They imply, first of all, that it must be a peace without victory. It is not pleasant to say this. I beg that I may be permitted to put my own interpretation upon it and that it may be understood that no other interpretation was in my thought. I am seeking only to face realities and to face them without soft concealments. *Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice, and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon quicksand.* Only a peace between equals can last. Only a peace the very principle of which is equality and a common participation in a common benefit. The right state of mind, the right feeling between nations, is as necessary for a lasting peace as is the just settlement of vexed questions of territory or of racial and national allegiance.

No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property. . . . Any peace which does not recognize and accept this principle will inevitably be upset. It will not rest upon the affections or the convictions of mankind. The ferment of spirit of whole populations will fight subtly and constantly against it, and all the world will sympathize. *The world can be at peace only if its life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is not tranquillity of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right.*

And the question of limiting naval armaments opens the wider and perhaps more difficult question of the limitation of armies and of all programmes of military preparation. Difficult and delicate as these questions are, they must be faced with the utmost candor and decided in a spirit of real accommodation if peace is to come with healing in its wings, and come to stay. Peace cannot be had without concession and sacrifice. There can be no sense of safety and equality among the nations if great preponderating armaments are henceforth to continue here and there to be built up and maintained.

—Address to the Senate, January 22, 1917

The World Made Safe for Democracy

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this war.

Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation's affairs. A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic Government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. . . .

We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, *the German peoples included;* for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. *The world must be made safe for democracy.* Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We must have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity towards a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible Government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. *We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reëstablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us—however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts.*

—Address to Congress, April 2, 1917

Reply to the Pope

. . . The object of this war is to deliver the free peoples of the world from the menace and the actual power of a vast military establishment controlled by an irresponsible Government. . . .

This power is not the German people. It is the ruthless master of the German people. . . .

Responsible statesmen must now everywhere see, if they never saw before, that no peace can rest securely upon political or economic restrictions meant to benefit some nations and cripple or embarrass others, upon vindictive action of any sort, or any kind of revenge or deliberate injury. The American people have suffered intolerable wrongs at the hands of the Imperial German

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government, *but they desire no reprisal upon the German people who have themselves suffered all things in this war which they did not choose.* They believe that peace should rest upon the rights of peoples, not the rights of Governments—the rights of peoples great or small, weak or powerful—their equal right to freedom and security and self-government and *to a participation upon fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world, the German people of course included if they will accept equality and not seek domination.*

The test, therefore, of every plan of peace is this: Is it based upon the faith of all the peoples involved or merely upon the word of an ambitious and intriguing Government on the one hand and of a group of free peoples on the other? This is a test which goes to the root of the matter; and it is the test which must be applied.

We believe that the intolerable wrongs done in this war by the furious and brutal power of the Imperial German Government ought to be repaired, but not at the expense of the sovereignty of any people—rather a vindication of the sovereignty both of those that are weak and of those that are strong. *Punitive damages, the dismemberment of empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues, we deem inexpedient and in the end worse than futile, no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace.* That must be based upon justice and fairness and the common rights of mankind.

—Reply to the Pope, August 27, 1917

"This Intolerable Thing"

. . . I believe that it is necessary to say plainly what we here at the seat of action consider the war to be for and what part we mean to play in the settlement of its searching issues. We are the spokesmen of the American people and they have a right to know whether their purpose is ours. . . .

I believe that I speak for them when I say two things: First, that this intolerable Thing of which the masters of Germany have shown us the ugly face, this menace of combined intrigue and force which we now see so clearly as the German power, A Thing without conscience or honor or capacity for covenanted peace, must be crushed and, if it be not utterly brought to an end, at least shut out from the friendly intercourse of the nations; and, second, that when this Thing and its power are indeed defeated and the time comes that we can discuss peace—when the German people have spokesmen whose word we can believe and when those spokesmen are ready in the name of their people to accept the common judgment of the nations as to what shall henceforth be the basis of law and of covenant for the life of the world—we shall be willing and glad to pay the full price for peace, and pay it ungrudgingly. We know what that price will be. It will be full, impartial justice—*justice done at every point and to every nation* that the final settlement must affect, our enemies as well as our friends.

You catch, with me, the voices of humanity that are in the air. They grow daily more audible, more articulate, more persuasive, and they come from the hearts of men everywhere. *They insist that the war shall not end in vindictive action of any kind; that no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done deep and abominable wrong. It is this thought that has been expressed in the formula, "No annexations, no contributions, no punitive indemnities."*

Let it be said again that autocracy must first be shown the utter futility of its claims to power or leadership in the modern world. But when that has been done—as, God willing, it assuredly will be—we must at last be free to do an unprecedented thing, and this is the time to avow our purpose to do it. *We shall be free to base peace on generosity and justice, to the exclusion of all selfish claims to advantage on the part of the victors.*

The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their Empire, a war of desperate self-defence against deliberate aggression. Nothing could be more grossly or wantonly false, and we must seek by the utmost openness and candor as to our real aims to convince them of its falseness. We are in fact fighting for their emancipation from fear, along with our own—from the fear as well as from the fact of unjust attack by neighbors or rivals or schemers after world empire. *No one is threatening the existence or the independence or the peaceful enterprise of the German Empire.*

The wrongs, the very deep wrongs, committed in this war will have to be righted. That of course. *But they cannot and must not be righted by the commission of similar wrongs against Germany and her allies.* The world will not permit the commission of similar wrongs as a means of reparation and settlement. Statesmen must by this time have learned that the opinion of the world is everywhere wide awake and fully comprehends the issues involved. *No representative of any self-governed nation will dare disregard it by attempting any such covenants of selfishness and compromise as were entered into at the Congress of Vienna.* The thought of the plain people here and everywhere throughout the world, the people who enjoy no privilege and have very simple and unsophisticated standards of right and wrong, is the air all governments must henceforth breathe if they would live. . . .

A supreme moment of history has come. The eyes of the people have been opened and they see. The hand of God is laid upon the nations. He will show them favor, I devoutly believe, only if they rise to the clear heights of His own justice and mercy.

—Address to Congress, December 4, 1917

II. At the Peace Conference

We have used great words, all of us have used the great words "Right" and "Justice," and now we are to prove whether or not we understand these words, and how they are to be applied to the particular settlements which must conclude this war. And we must not only understand them, but *we must have the courage to act upon our understanding.*

—Speech at Buckingham Palace, London, December 27, 1918

. . . They fought to do away with an old order and to establish a new one, and the centre and characteristic of the old order was that unstable thing which we used to call the "Balance of Power," a thing in which the balance was determined by the sword which was thrown in on the one side or the other, a balance which was determined by the unstable equilibrium of competitive interests, a balance which was maintained by jealous watchfulness and an antagonism of interests which, though it was generally latent, was always deep-seated.

—Speech at London, December 28, 1918

It is from quiet places like this all over the world that the forces are accumulated that presently will overpower any attempt to accomplish evil on a great scale. It is like the rivulet that gathers into the river and the river that goes to the sea. So there come out of communities like these streams that fertilize the conscience of men, and it is the conscience of the world we now mean to place upon the throne which others tried to usurp.

—Address at the Lowther Street Congregational Church, London, December 29, 1918

And so it does seem to me that the theme that we must have in our minds now in this great day of settlement is the theme of common interest and the determination of what it is that is our common interest. . . .

EDUCATION LIBRARY
COLUMBIA-HALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . For the moment there is the slightest departure from the nice adjustment of interests, then jealousies begin to spring up. There is only one thing that can bind peoples together, and that is common devotion to right.

Therefore it seems to me that in the settlement which is just ahead of us something more delicate and difficult than was ever attempted before has to be accomplished—a genuine concert of mind and of purpose. . . .

We must provide the machinery for readjustments in order that we have the machinery of good-will and friendship. Friendship must have a machinery. If I cannot correspond with you, not coöperate with you, I cannot be your friend; and if the world is to remain a body of friends, it must have the means of friendship, the means of constant friendly intercourse, the means for constant watchfulness over the common interests.

—Speech at Manchester, England, December 30, 1918

But we cannot stand in the shadow of this war without knowing there are things which are in some senses more difficult than those we have undertaken, because, while it is easy to speak of right and justice, it is sometimes difficult to work them out in practice, and there will be required a *purity of motives and disinterestedness of object which the world has never witnessed before in the councils of nations.*

There is only one thing that holds nations together, if you exclude force, and that is friendship and good-will. The only thing that binds men together is friendship, and by the same token the only thing that binds nations together is friendship. Therefore our task at Paris is to organize the friendship of the world—to see to it that all the moral forces that make for right and justice and liberty are united *and are given a vital organization to which the peoples of the world will readily and gladly respond.*

—Speech to Italian Deputies at Rome, January 3, 1919

. . . Perhaps you gentlemen think of the members of your Government and the members of other Governments who are going to confer in the city of Paris as the real makers of war and peace; but we are not. You are the makers of war and of peace. The pulse of the modern world beats on the farms and in the mines and in the factories. . . .

. . . That is one reason why unless we establish friendships, unless we establish sympathies, we clog all the processes of modern life. . . .

—Speech to the Citizens of Turin, Italy, January 6, 1919

We are here to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. Those foundations were the private choice of a small coterie of civil rulers and military staffs. Those foundations were the aggression of great Powers upon the small. Those foundations were the power of small bodies of men to wield their will and use mankind as pawns in a game. And *nothing less than the emancipation of the world from these things will accomplish peace.*

—Address before the Peace Conference, January 25, 1919

So it is for that reason that I have said to those with whom I am at present associated, that this must be a peoples' peace, because this was a peoples' war. The people won this war, not the Governments, and the people must reap the benefits of the war. At every turn we must see to it that it is not an adjustment between Governments merely, but an arrangement for the peace and security of men and women everywhere.

—Address to Delegation of Working Women, Paris, January 26, 1919

The rulers of the world have been thinking of the relations of Governments and forgetting the relations of peoples. They have been thinking of the manœuvres of international dealings, when what they ought to have been thinking of was the fortunes of men and women and the safety of homes, and the care that they should take that their people should be happy because they were safe.

The nations of the world are about to consummate a brotherhood which will make it unnecessary in the future to maintain those crushing armaments which make the peoples suffer almost as much in peace as they suffered in war.

So, as we sit from day to day at the Quai d'Orsay I think to myself, we might, if we could gain an audience of the free peoples of the world, adopt the language of General Pershing and say, "Friends, men, humble women, little children, we are here; we are here as your friends, as your champions, as your representatives. We have come to work out for you a world which is fit to live in and in which all countries can enjoy the heritage of liberty for which France and America and England and Italy have paid so dear."

—Speech in the Chamber of Deputies, Paris, February 3, 1919

. . . The men who are in conference in Paris realize as keenly as any American can realize that they are not the masters of their people; that they are the servants of their people, and that the spirit of their people has awakened to a new purpose and a new conception of their power to realize that purpose, *and that no man dare go home from that conference and report anything less noble than was expected of it.*

And I said I have had this sweet revenge: speaking with perfect frankness, in the name of the people of the United States, I have uttered as the objects of this great war ideals, and nothing but ideals, and the war has been won by that inspiration. . . .

—Message to the American People, at Boston, February 24, 1919

. . . Do not let yourselves suppose for a moment that the uneasiness in the populations of Europe is due entirely to economic causes or economic motives; something very much deeper underlies it all than that. They see that their Governments have never been able to defend them against intrigue or aggression, and that there is no force of foresight or of prudence in any modern Cabinet to stop war. And therefore they say, "There must be some fundamental cause for this," and the fundamental cause they are beginning to perceive to be that nations have stood singly or in little jealous groups against each other, fostering prejudice, increasing the danger of war rather than concerting measures to prevent it; *and that if there is right in the world, if there is justice in the world, there is no reason why nations should be divided in the support of justice.*

They are therefore saying if you really believe that there is a right, if you really believe that wars ought to be stopped, stop thinking about the rival interests of nations, and think about men and women and children throughout the world. . . .

. . . There can be no mercy where there is no hope, for why should you spare another if you yourself expect to perish? Why should you be pitiful if you can get no pity? Why should you be just if, upon every hand, you are put upon?

—Address at Metropolitan Opera House, March 4, 1919

The war was ended, moreover, by proposing to Germany an armistice and peace which should be founded on certain clearly defined principles which set up a new order of right and justice. *Upon those principles the peace with Germany has been conceived, not only, but formulated. Upon those principles it will be executed.*

—Statement Dealing with the Italian-Jugoslav Dispute, at Paris, April 23, 1919

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III. Obiter Dicta

. . . To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the Resolutions of the German Reichstag of the ninth of July last, the spirit and intention of the liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening, in fact, to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answers to them depends the peace of the world.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; *so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world.*

. . . We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this programme that impairs it. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. *We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world—the new world in which we now live—instead of a place of mastery.*

—Address to Congress, January 8, 1918

We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government, and the undictated development of all peoples, and every feature of the settlement that concludes this war must be conceived and executed for that purpose. Wrongs must first be righted and then adequate safeguards must be created to prevent their being committed again. . . .

. . . *No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish to live. No territory must change hands except for the purpose of securing those who inhabit it a fair chance of life and liberty. No indemnities must be insisted on except those that constitute payments for manifest wrongs done. No readjustments of power must be made except such as will tend to secure the future peace of the world and the future welfare and happiness of its peoples.*

—Cablegram to Russia, May 26, 1917

If it be indeed and in truth the common object of the Governments associated against Germany and of the nations whom they govern, as I believe it to be, to achieve by the coming settlements a secure and lasting peace, it will be necessary that all who sit down at the peace table shall come ready and willing to pay the price, the only price, that will procure it. That price is impartial justice in every item of the settlement, no matter whose interest is crossed; and not only impartial justice, but also the satisfaction of the several peoples whose fortunes are dealt with. . . .

. . . The counsels of plain men have become on all hands more simple and straightforward and more unified than the counsels of sophisticated men of affairs, who still retain the impression that they are playing a game of power and playing for high stakes. That is why I have said that this is a people's war, not a statesmen's. *Statesmen must follow the clarified common thought or be broken.*

Special alliances and economic rivalries and hostilities have been the prolific source in the modern world of the plans and passions that produce war. It would be an insincere as well as an insecure peace that did not exclude them in definite and binding terms.

—Address at Metropolitan Opera House, September 27, 1918

. . . We know now as clearly as we knew before we were ourselves engaged that we are not the enemies of the German people and that they are not our enemies. They did not originate or desire this hideous war or wish that we should be drawn into it; *and we are vaguely conscious that we are fighting their cause, as they will some day see it, as well as our own.*

. . . And the great fact that stands out above all the rest is that this is a People's War, a war for freedom and justice and self-government amongst all the nations of the world, a war to make the world safe for the peoples who live upon it and have made it their own, *the German people themselves included.*

Flag Day Speech, June 14, 1917

. . . I believe that the spirit of freedom can get into the hearts of Germans and find as fine a welcome there as it can find in any other hearts. . . .

Moreover, a settlement is always hard to avoid when the parties can be brought face to face. I can differ from a man much more radically when he is not in the room than I can when he is in the room, because then the awkward thing is he can come back at me and answer what I say. It is always dangerous for a man to have the floor entirely to himself. *Therefore, we must insist in every instance that the parties come into each other's presence and there discuss the issues between them, and not separately in places which have no communication with each other.*

—Buffalo Address, November 12, 1917

. . . If the contest must continue to proceed toward undefined ends by slow attrition until the one group of belligerents or the other is exhausted, if millions after millions of human lives must continue to be offered up until on the one side or the other there are no more to offer, if resentments must be kindled that can never cool and despairs engendered from which there can be no recovery, hopes of peace and of the willing concert of free peoples will be rendered vain and idle.

—Note to Germany, December 18, 1917

. . . There had been growing up in Europe a mutual suspicion, an interchange of conjectures about what this Government and that Government was going to do, an interlacing of alliances and understandings, a complex web of intrigue and spying, that presently was sure to entangle the whole of the family of mankind on that side of the water in its meshes. *Now, revive that after this war is over and sooner or later you will have just such another war.* . . .

—Address at Cincinnati, October 26, 1916

. . . *We are ready, whenever the final reckoning is made, to be just to the German people, deal fairly with the German power, as with all others. There can be no difference between peoples in the final judgment, if it is indeed to be a righteous judgment. To purpose anything but justice, even-handed and dispassionate justice, to Germany at any time, whatever the outcome of the war, would be to renounce and dishonor our own cause, for we ask nothing that we are not willing to accord.*

. . . They (the military masters of Germany) are enjoying in Russia a cheap triumph in which no brave or gallant nation can long take pride. A great people, helpless by their own act, lies for the time at their mercy. Their fair profes-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sions are forgotten. They nowhere set up justice, but everywhere impose their power and exploit everything for their own use and aggrandizement; and the peoples of conquered provinces are invited to be free under their dominion!

—Liberty Loan Speech in Baltimore, April 6, 1918

. . . Repeated utterances of the leading statesmen of most of the great nations now engaged in war have made it plain that their thought has come to this, that the principle of public right must henceforth take precedence over the individual interests of particular nations, and that the nations of the world must in some way band themselves together to see that right prevails as against any sort of selfish aggression; *that henceforth alliance must not be set up against alliance, understanding against understanding, but that there must be a common agreement for a common object, and that at the heart of that common object must lie the inviolable rights of peoples and of mankind.* The nations of the world have become each other's neighbors. It is to their interest that they should understand each other. In order that they may understand each other, it is imperative that they should agree to coöperate in a common cause, and that they should so act that the guiding principle of that common cause shall be even-handed and impartial justice.

—Address to the League to Enforce Peace, May 27, 1916

. . . You do not love humanity if you seek to divide humanity into jealous camps. Humanity can be welded together only by love, by sympathy, by justice, not by jealousy and hatred. . . .

—Address to Naturalized Citizens, May 10, 1915

IV. The Conditions of Peace

The Fourteen Points

I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

III. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

IV. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

V. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined.

VI. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest coöperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

VII. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

VIII. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

XI. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

XII. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

XIII. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

XIV. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

—Address to Congress, January 8, 1918

Four Factors of World Peace

There can be but one issue. The settlement must be final. There can be no compromise. No halfway decision would be tolerable. No halfway decision is conceivable. These are the ends for which the associated peoples of the world are fighting and which must be conceded them before there can be peace:

I. The destruction of every arbitrary power anywhere that can separately, secretly, and of its single choice disturb the peace of the world; or, if it cannot be presently destroyed, at the least its reduction to virtual impotence.

II. The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship, upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery.

III. The consent of all nations to be governed in their conduct toward each other by the same principles of honor and of respect for the common law of civilized society that govern the individual citizens of all modern states in their relations with one another; to the end that all promises and covenants may be sacredly observed, no private plots or conspiracies hatched, no

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selfish injuries wrought with impunity, and a mutual trust established upon the handsome foundation of a mutual respect for right.

IV. The establishment of an organization of peace which shall make it certain that the combined power of free nations will check every invasion of right and serve to make peace and justice the more secure by affording a definite tribunal of opinion to which all must submit and by which every international readjustment that cannot be amicably agreed upon by the peoples directly concerned shall be sanctioned.

These great objects can be put into a single sentence. What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind.

These great ends cannot be achieved by debating and seeking to reconcile and accommodate what statesmen may wish with their projects for balances of power and of national opportunity. They can be realized only by the determination of what the thinking peoples of the world desire.

—Address at Mt. Vernon, July 4, 1918

Five Requisites of Permanent Peace

These, then, are some of the particulars, and I state them with the greater confidence because I can state them authoritatively as representing this Government's interpretation of its own duty with regard to peace:

First, the impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favorites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned;

Second, *no special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all;*

Third, there can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations;

Fourth, and more specifically, there can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the League and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control;

Fifth, all international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world.

—Address at Metropolitan Opera House, September 27, 1918

Five Questions on Permanent Peace

We accepted the issues of the war as facts, not as any group of men either here or elsewhere had defined them, and we can accept no outcome which does not squarely meet and settle them. Those issues are these:

Shall the military power of any nation or group of nations be suffered to determine the fortunes of peoples over whom they have no right to rule except the right of force?

Shall strong nations be free to wrong weak nations and make them subject to their purpose and interest?

Shall peoples be ruled and dominated, even in their own internal affairs, by arbitrary and irresponsible force or by their own will and choice?

Shall there be a common standard of right and privilege for all peoples and nations, or shall the strong do as they will and the weak suffer without redress?

Shall the assertion of right be haphazard and by casual alliance or shall there be a common concert to oblige the observance of common rights?

—Address at Metropolitan Opera House, September 27, 1918

Liberal Criticism

William Allen White

PARIS, May 12.—The past week has developed the opposition of radical Europe to the peace treaty. But unquestionably middle-class conservative opinion is for the treaty. In France only the Monarchist newspapers condemn the treaty among conservative journals, and two-thirds of the Socialist papers join the Monarchist press in denouncing it. In England only labor journals denounce the treaty. . . .

A similar situation exists in Rome, and it is evident that President Wilson has lost the radical support which gave to him his power in December and January. He is blamed by the radicals for two distinct kinds of things: first, for deserting his point of self-determination of peoples in taking the Saar valley from Germany, Shantung from China, and Danzig from Germany; and, second, for the severity of the treaty upon Germany.

Detailed examination of the treaty has left even conservative opinion in Europe frankly cynical about Germany's fulfillment of the terms imposed. The terms are too severe for any nation to live under for a generation. . . .

Paris expects Germany to sign the treaty with fingers crossed. For the treaty practically exterminates Germany as a nation. Under the treaty Germany cannot control her railroads and waterways, cannot levy her own taxes, cannot control her imports and exports, and cannot build her own navy to replace her lost boats. She has no right over the air above Germany for German airplanes, no right to build railroads across her own territory and no rights on the high seas.

A curious sidelight upon peace is that French radical papers are devoting more space today to the tremendous funeral demonstration for the Socialist killed on May Day than they are to the peace terms. The funeral called out thousands of red-flag Socialists, many former soldiers marching under the red banner. These were people who five months ago were following President Wilson about in mobs. They have left him as quickly as they came to him.

—William Allen White, in the World, May 14, 1919

Frank A. Vanderlip

LONDON, May 10 (Associated Press).—*"There are no terms written in the treaty that can bring peace to Europe,"* said Frank A. Vanderlip, President of the National City Bank of New York, before sailing for New York today, after several weeks in England and on the Continent. "The real treaty of peace," he said, "will be the plan whereby Europe will be able to get machinery, rolling stock, and raw material and be placed in a position to help herself.

"It is not that Bolshevism is rampant in Europe. The sway of Bolshevism is rapidly waning in Russia, its progress is halted in Hungary, but idleness, want, and hunger are the breeding ground of the microbe of social unrest. There can be political safety nowhere when idleness and want become acute.

"The restarting of the wheels of industry everywhere in Europe is a prerequisite to security. Partial success in doing that is not enough, for wherever it is not done that place becomes a breeding centre for social unrest and perhaps even political revolution.

"Europe must be put in a position to help herself. A way must be found to supply machinery and raw material to every European nation to make a beginning toward restarting the industrial process. *An effective plan for doing that would be a real treaty of peace."*

—New York Times, May 11, 1919

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Berne Labor-Socialist Conference

PARIS, May 12.—The League of Nations covenant was described as a league of Governments and executives rather than of peoples and parliaments in a statement issued by International Socialists tonight criticising the peace terms and the covenant. It is declared that the covenant seems to be the instrument of a victorious coalition dominated by five great Powers rather than an organ of international justice in which all nations ought to find a place.

Failure to include Germany and Russia in the League of Nations, the statement asserts, must be righted speedily if the League is to be made effective for preventing war. The limitation of German armaments without application of restrictions to other nations also is criticised, and the attention of the labor world is called to the danger resulting from the establishment of the boundaries of Poland, which, it is held, does violence to the rights of people to choose their political allegiance, and by separating German states into two separate parts. These things are said to create a danger which will remain a source of trouble and ill will.

"The callous handing over of Shantung with its resources and 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 Chinese to Japanese economic control cannot be passed over in silence," the statement says.

Regarding the Sarre valley, the statement recognizes the justice of Germany being obliged to furnish France and Belgium with coal and compensation for the destruction of mines, but utters a suspicion that the arrangements for the administration of the district conceal aims for dismemberment.

The disposal of the German colonies is regarded by the Socialists as "imperialism satisfying itself with the spoils of war." The statement concludes:

"This peace is not our peace. The nations are still menaced by the policy of the victors in sharing the spoils without thought of the inevitable consequences."

The statement is signed by the following Socialists, who were appointed by the Berne Labor Socialist Conference to make a study of the covenant and the treaty: Hjalmar Branting, Sweden; Camille Huysmans, Belgium; Arthur Henderson, J. Ramsay MacDonald, and G. H. Stuart Bunning of Great Britain, and Pierre Renaudel and Jean Longuet of France.

—New York Times, May 14, 1919

French Socialists

PARIS, May 11.—The General Assembly of Socialists of Paris and the Department of the Seine adopted resolutions today protesting against the peace treaty, in which it says: "Justice is violated in nearly every phrase."

One speaker demanded that the Socialist Deputies refuse to approve the treaty. Marcel Cachin, Socialist Deputy and director of the newspaper *Humanité*, said that he had refused to subscribe to the terms for his part and would conform his action in the Chamber of Deputies to the decisions of the party. He denied the right of the German delegates at Versailles to negotiate in the name of "New Germany."

Another speaker demanded a plébiscite for Alsace-Lorraine, and said that the treaty consecrated the failure of the policy of the man in whom the Socialist party once had confidence—President Wilson.

—New York Times, May 12, 1919

British Labor

LONDON, May 8.—After meeting to consider the terms of peace imposed upon Germany by the Allied and associated nations, the National Executive Committee of the British Labor party tonight issued a manifesto declaring the treaty in some essential particulars "opposed to the declarations of President Wilson, of the Inter-Allied Labor Conference and the Berne Conference, and very defective from the standpoint of world peace."

"It bears evidence of a compromise by capitalism and imperialism which still dominate European states," the manifesto declared. "Any permanent denial to Germany of an opportunity to become a mandatary under the League of Nations must cause jealousy and unrest leading to further international disputes."

Other points criticised were the failure to give Germany representation on the Reparation Commission and the omission of provisions for a progressive limitation of armaments by the other signatories to the treaty. The manifesto protested against the permanent separation of the Sarre Basin from Germany, and advocated a plébiscite in Malmedy and other contested territories between Belgium and Germany.

—New York Times, May 10, 1919

Women's Peace Conference

PARIS, Wednesday, May 14.—The Women's International Conference for Permanent Peace, which is meeting at Zurich, has sent the following communication to the Peace Conference:

"This international congress of women expresses deep regret that the terms of the peace proposal at Versailles should so seriously violate the principles upon which alone a just and lasting peace can be secured and which the democrats of the world had come to expect. By guaranteeing the fruits of secret treaties to the conquerors, the terms of peace have tacitly sanctioned secret diplomacy, denied the principle of self-determination, recognized the rights of the victors to the spoils and created all over Europe discords and animosities which can only lead to future wars.

"By demanding disarmament from one set of belligerents only, the principle of justice is violated and the rule of force is continued. By the financial and economic proposals, 100,000,000 people of this generation in the heart of Europe are condemned to poverty, disease, and despair, which must result in the spread of hatred and anarchy within each nation.

"With a deep sense of responsibility, this congress strongly urges the Allied Governments to bring the peace treaty into harmony with those principles first enunciated by President Wilson, upon the faithful carrying out of which the honor of the Allied peoples depends."

—New York Globe, May 15, 1919

British Press

"We demand both the golden eggs and the corpse of the goose that would lay them. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that Germany is first stripped naked and is then told to turn out her pockets."

—The Daily News, May 8, 1919

"There is no honor left for any of us. The League of Nations is a body without a soul. President Wilson has been beaten. He forced public acceptance of his high ideals on the other Powers, but they have beaten him secretly. He compromised on essentials, and therefore the details have gone astray. *From the moment he abandoned the first of the Fourteen Points, he abandoned them all."*

—The London Herald, May 8, 1919

"These terms give no fundamental solution to any European problem. They revolve in the vicious virulence of the old diplomacy, they repeat the fatal precedents which have always led back to war and made the end of one struggle the direct cause of another. *There will be quarrels, conspiracies, agitations, assassinations, revolutions, and collapses.*

—J. L. Garvin, in the Sunday Observer, May 10, 1919

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED